LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
SEP 20 1941
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BR 170 .S63
Setton, Kenneth Meyer, 1914-
Christian attitude towards
the emperor in the fourth

STUDIES IN HISTORY, ECONOMICS AND PUBLIC LAW

Edited by the

FACULTY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

NUMBER 482

CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE EMPEROR IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

BY

KENNETH M. SETTON

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
SEP 20 1941
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE EMPEROR IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

Especially As Shown in Addresses to the Emperor

BY
KENNETH M. SETTON, Ph.D.
INSTRUCTOR IN CLASSICS AND ANCIENT HISTORY
BOSTON UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: P. S. KING & SON, LTD.
1941

Copyright, 1941

by

Columbia University Press

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

WILLIAM GOODWIN AURELIO

AMICO ET MAGISTRO

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Professor Lynn Thorndike I am deeply indebted for the time and thought he chose to invest in this book. The subject was his suggestion, and the research was begun in his seminar in European intellectual history at Columbia. I owe him more than a passing expression of gratitude. I owe him almost the whole of what understanding I have of the research historian's task. Only one whom he has to a like measure made the recipient of his kindness and his guidance will appreciate the extent of my debt and the depth of my gratitude to him.

It is a pleasure also to express my thanks to Professor Dino Bigongiari for his reading of the entire manuscript and to Professors Eugene H. Byrne, Austin P. Evans, Kurt von Fritz, and William L. Westerman for reading parts of the book in proof. They have contributed both to the style of the work and to its accuracy, but I must claim the inadequacies of the work for myself. I am grateful to Professors W. G. Aurelio and A. H. Rice, my former teachers and my present colleagues, for allowing me to consult them on the translation of some difficult passages in the Fathers. Professors Aurelio and M. E. Agnew of Boston University and Mr. Robert E. Tschan of Columbia College have aided me in the arduous task of correcting proofs. They have my lasting thanks; proofreading is the final test of friendship.

To the history department of Columbia I would reiterate my thanks for appointment as University Fellow during 1938-39 and to Boston University for six appointments through as many years as Scholar and Fellow under the Professor Augustus Howe Buck Educational Fund, which made possible for me not only undergraduate study but also periods of graduate study at the University of Chicago and at Harvard.

My chief regret as I take leave of the book is that it is not more worthy of the Universities which made it possible, the scholar under whom it was written, and the teacher to whom it is dedicated.

K.M.S.

Boston University
21 January, 1941.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE
I Introduction 11
II Eusebius and Constantine the Great 40
III Constans and the Early Years of Constantius 57
IV Arian Deference and Athanasian Opposition 78
V St. Ambrose 109
VI Philosophy before the Throne 152
VII St. John Chrysostom 163
  I. Chrysostom and the Imperial Court 163
  II. Chrysostom's View of the Imperial Office 187
VIII Imperial Images 196
IX Epilogue 212

ABBREVIATIONS AND ABRIDGED TITLES 219

INDICES 221

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE present study seeks to depict the patristic attitude towards the person and office of the Roman Emperor in the fourth century. Particular attention is paid to letters, speeches, panegyrics, and the like, which were addressed directly to the Emperor. The language employed by the Fathers in these addresses is described and analyzed where it contributes to an understanding of the place of the Emperor in Christian thought of the century in which Christianity achieved official victory over the religions which had been its rivals in the Empire. Titles of address to the Emperor are listed in full and discussed; the usage of one Father is compared to or contrasted with that of another. Where the attitude of the Fathers as expressed in works directed to the Emperor is at variance with what they say of the Emperor in works not intended for the latter's perusal, the fact is considered, and we shall note the very discernible effect the Sacred Presence had upon the expressed attitude of certain Fathers, most notably Sts. Athanasius and Hilary of Poitiers, towards the anointed of God.

But to secure a more complete understanding of how the Fathers regarded the Emperor and his office and to escape the bias and reticence generally apparent in works written *ad hominem,* all the works of the fourth century Fathers, and more especially their historical essays and theological tractates, have been examined. They will be considered where they throw light on what the Fathers thought about the character of the imperial office, its divine origin and sanctity, its limitations, the duties and functions pertaining to it, its relations to the episcopacy on the one hand and to the whole ecclesiastical polity on the other. We shall thus be more interested in the Christian attitude towards the Emperor as such than in the reaction of individual Fathers to individual Emperors. Nevertheless since the policies and personalities of certain Emperors in the fourth century, particularly Constantine, Constantius, and Theodosius, went far towards determining what the patristic attitude towards the Emperor and his place in the Christian State should be, some attention will have to be paid to this aspect of the problem.

The striking change to be observed in the Fathers' attitude towards the Emperor in the latter's relation to the Church in the course of this century is a matter of much importance to us. This change will be investigated and explained as I understand its nature and its causes. Here, too, we shall find that the tone and attitude adopted by Constantius as supreme ruler of the Christian State towards the orthodox Bishops of his day provoked their opposition, while this fact in turn determined in large part the tone and attitude adopted by those Bishops towards Constantius as their Emperor and as ruler of the Christian State. A comparison of the Arian and orthodox attitudes towards the Emperor, in so far as the scanty evidence allows, will be made in connection with our discussion of St. Athanasius, the great opponent and historian of the Arian movement. The struggle of *imperium* and *sacerdotium* will be traced in so far as it illustrates and is a part of the patristic attitude towards the Emperor.

Although knowledge of the political and ecclesiastical history of the fourth century is taken for granted throughout this study, we shall not lose sight of the fact that *aliter dicunt homines ac faciunt,* and so the actual dealings of the Fathers with the Emperor and his court will now and again be described where such dealings have seemed to possess illustrative value and to be of adequate significance. Most noteworthy in this respect is the first part of the chapter on St. John Chrysostom, whose relations with the Emperor are at least as revealing of his attitude as what he has to say about the Emperor in his works.

The method of investigation, therefore, has been to put leading questions, so to speak, covering these diverse topics of interest, to the Fathers and from their answers, where they had any to give on a particular matter, to indicate their position. St. Ambrose would appear to have known most of the answers. While the study is basically concerned, as its title indicates, with patristic addresses to the Emperor, a rounded estimate of the Fathers' attitude towards the imperial office has nonetheless been sought. Discussion of the Fathers will be chiefly chronological, beginning with Eusebius of Caesarea, except where similar or dissimilar points of view may make more orderly or more convenient our grouping certain of the Fathers together. No more than passing reference will be made to St. Jerome (died 420 A. D.) and to St. Augustine (died 430 A. D.). Much of their literary activity lay in the fifth century while we shall confine our attention for the most part to the fourth century. Their attitudes towards the Emperor and the State are also pretty well known, and, it would appear, grew largely from the points of view formulated by Athanasius and Ambrose before them. Discussion of them, too, while contributing little if anything, would have increased the present book to too great size. But a chapter has been added on patristic notices of images of the Emperor, the use by the Fathers of such images for purposes of illustration in their religious teaching, and the distinction so carefully drawn by Christians in the fourth century (and later centuries) between Christian adoration and pagan worship of the Emperor.

Before we fix our attention upon the main theme of this study, however, some consideration of four different topics is necessary by way of introduction. First, we must understand as well as we can the attitude towards the Emperor taken on the one hand by Jesus and on the other by the various writers of the New Testament, for these views are the bases of later patristic opinions, although sometimes, as we shall see, the latter show strange aberrances from the former. Second, we must take stock of both the pagan and Christian views of the origin of imperial authority, for later on we shall have occasion to refer to them. Third, for purposes of contrast and comparison, we must analyze as a type pagan panegyrical addresses to—and consider the attitude therein expressed towards—the Emperor. Lastly, we should consider pre-Constantinian Christian addresses to the Emperor as an indispensable background for the chapters that follow.

Whatever Jesus's attitude towards the imperial State may have been, his attitude towards the Emperor was the same, for the Emperor and the State were in a very real sense identical. Although the early Christian apologists and the Church Fathers expound the Pauline view that "there is no power but of God, and the powers that be are ordained of God" (Romans 13:1), there is absolutely no reason to believe that Jesus held that view. The truth of the matter is that in the *ipsissima verba* of the Master there is not enough evidence to ascribe to him any extensive or profound political philosophy. Jesus's attitude towards the Emperor, nevertheless, does not seem to have differed fundamentally from his attitude towards Herod Antipas or the administrators of the Jewish commonwealth. But perhaps all that can be said safely is that Jesus believed the State to be in origin neither divine nor satanic. It was rather an instrument evolved by human experience and designed to meet the multiple needs of the society of his day.[1] Like man himself, therefore, government was neither all good nor all bad, neither blindly to be obeyed nor summarily to be rejected.

When the Pharisees and the Herodians confronted Jesus with the question whether the civil tribute (*census*) should be paid to the Emperor, he made the famous statement, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's" (Matthew 22:20-21; Mark 12:16-17; *cf.* Luke 20:24-25). It is obviously easy in interpreting such a cryptic remark to read into it far more than was ever intended. What is to be rendered unto God is not our problem, but rather what is to be rendered unto Caesar. Jesus clearly regarded the Emperor as entitled to certain taxes from the Jews, probably the capitation tax, and he would seem thereby to reject the Zealots' program of national rebellion and also their refusal to submit to any dictate of the imperial government. The contrast between Caesar and God in no wise indicates that he regarded the imperial rule as established by God. But is there something in this remark that was to be implied by his auditors, and which is not explicitly stated? Coinage under the Empire, like ancient coinage in general, not only served as a medium of exchange, but it possessed also a certain medallic quality. The image (*eikon*) and legend (*epigraphe*) upon the coin that was handed to Christ were an element of religious symbolism in the Emperor-cult. The obverse legend on the coin probably read, *Ti*(*berius*) *Caesar divi Aug*(*usti*) *f*(*ilius*) *Augustus*.[2] The use of such coinage was abhorrent to Christians and Jews alike, and was thought by those who refused absolutely to compromise with their conscience to constitute virtual acceptance of the godhead of the Emperor. It has been alleged that Jesus broke with past tradition in refusing to see in the use of coinage of supposedly cult significance any *ipso facto* participation in Emperor-worship. Did he then add, however, lest he should be misunderstood, that worship was to be reserved for God alone (" and unto God the things that are God's ")? Is this a tacit denunciation of Emperor-worship, as Deissmann believes? The latter asserts that Jesus's remark was made " in stillem Protest gegen den Cäsarenkult ".[3] It is not impossible that he is right, but his interpretation, suggestive as it is, is too subtle to be convincing. For the rest, I pass over much controversy on the part of scholars whose conviction it is, regardless of other disagreements, that the zig-zag line is the most effective means of connecting two points.[4]

---

[1] *Cf.* C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World* (Edinburgh, 1925), pp. 34-40, 47-50.

Whatever the difficulties in the interpretation of details, hatred of the Emperor is very prominent in the Book of Revelation, and it may well be that continued resistance to imperial cult-worship, with its consequent persecution, elevated general disobedience and hostility to the Emperor in the eyes of many Christians into something of a sacred duty. But Paul enjoined upon Christians submission to the imperial government, and urged "tribute (*phoros*) to whom tribute is due, custom (*telos*) to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor" (Romans 13:7). To whom, indeed, more than to the Emperor? It was clearly thus that Paul understood the admonition in the (not yet written) synoptics to render unto Caesar the things that were Caesar's. The author of the Epistle to Titus would also remind Christians of their duty to be submissive and obedient to their rulers (Titus 3:1). Peter, or whoever wrote the first Epistle under his name, warned that Christians should submit to every human institution (*ktisis*) for the Lord's sake, whether to the Emperor (*basileus*) as supreme or to his appointed governors (*hegemones*), and he added, "Honor the Emperor" (1 Peter 2:13-14, 17). Whereas it is important to note that Peter regarded the Emperor's government as a human institution (*anthropine ktisis),* Paul ascribed to it a divine origin, and considered the Emperor but an instrument of the divine wrath and a minister of God for ultimate good (Romans 13: 1-6). It was Paul's attitude towards the Emperor, rather than Jesus's, Paul's interpretation of the saying "Render unto Caesar", rather than Jesus's meaning, that we shall find given constant emphasis and repetition in the Church Fathers of the fourth century whose attitude towards the Emperor we shall investigate in the following pages. In determining the *Kaisergedanke* of the New Testament no passage ranks in importance with Paul's Epistle to the Romans 13:1-7. But this Epistle was written (from Corinth in 52 A. D.?) before Christianity had been recognized by the Emperor's government as a *religio illicita,* and Paul could not foresee that, when such had become the case, obedience to the Emperor on the part of Christians was going to mean violation of a Christian conscience. Had Paul not written while Christians were at peace, who knows but what like Peter he would not have derived from God the sanctions wielded by the Emperor? How different then would have been the whole *Tendenz* of Christian political thought in both the patristic and medieval periods! Our concern, however, is not with what might have been, but with what was; yet it is well to remember sometimes the chance character of the origin of so many basic attitudes in intellectual history.

---

[2] F. W. Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage* (London, 1864), p. 247; *idem, Coins of the Jews* (Boston, 1881), p. 292.

[3] Adolph Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* (4 ed. Tübingen, 1923), p. 214.

[4] *Cf.* the labored interpretation, for example, of Mr. Conrad Noel, " Render unto Caesar," *Christendom* II (Oxford, 1932), pp. 121-127.

It was hardly thought possible in New Testament times that Emperors and other rulers might actually be converted to Christianity (Acts 9:15; *cf.* 26:27-29), and the changes which imperial conversion might entail, not alone in the Christian attitude towards the Emperor, but in the whole ecclesiastical polity, were not envisaged in the most ambitious Christian speculation of the first and second centuries. We shall consider this important question when we discuss the respective attitudes of Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius of Alexandria towards the Emperor.

The Roman Emperors had inherited in the eastern provinces like Egypt and Syria, whether they might profess to wish it or not,[5] the cult-worship that had been accorded to their Hellenistic predecessors. Provincial populations, long accustomed to ruler-worship, apparently brought pressure to bear upon the Emperors to take official cognizance of various unofficial municipal cults which were organized in their honor after Hellenistic models. But Hellenistic ruler-worship had its beginnings in the entirely Greek custom of rendering semi-divine honors to heroes. Although there is perhaps no convincing evidence to support the view sometimes put forward that constitutive elements were supplied to Hellenistic ruler-worship from the antecedent cult-practices of the Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, or Persians, it is important, nevertheless, to bear in mind that Ptolemies and Seleucids became objects of *cultus* in lands where traditions of ruler-worship were centuries old. The influence, even if no longer traceable, must not have been inconsiderable. Such was the heritage of the Roman Emperors to whom thus came both the devotion and the cult-titles that the populations of the eastern Mediterranean world had previously given to Hellenistic monarchs. Many of these titles and religious terms came to present painful similarities with the technical language of the New Testament, for Christians in the two generations after Christ appear, perhaps rather consciously, to have modeled their Septuagint heritage in no small part after the Emperor-worship they despised as idolatry.

---

[5] Compare the answer of Claudius (41 A. D.) to the Alexandrians who sought sanction for the local cult of the God-Emperor: *P. Lond.* 1912, 48-51, ed. H. Idris Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (1924), p. 24.

The parallelism between the contemporary Christian and imperial-cult language is very striking indeed, and of considerable importance in understanding the Christian attitude towards the Emperor in New Testament times. These resemblances were sometimes coincidental, of course, but they were none the less real. Many very significant words were duplicated. Both Christ and the Emperor were called or referred to as *theos* and *theou huios, kyrios* (with the adjective *kyriakos*), *basileus,* and *soter* (with *sosikosmios*). A remarkably similar usage prevailed both in Christian worship and the Emperor-cult with regard to such words as *theiotes* (and the adjective *theios*), *euergetes, theologos* and *sebastologos, archiereus, evangelion, parousia* and *epiphaneia, hiera* and *theia grammata, doulos, diakonos, apeleutheros, philokaisar* or *philosebastos* and *philochristos, sebastognostos* and *theognostos, Kaisarianos* and *Christianos.* Most of these words had Latin equivalents or were transliterated into Latin in the West. Christians in the West, for example, from the time of Tertullian were accustomed to call Christ *Imperator.*[6] The history of such expressions is too well known to be discussed here,[7] but an illustration or two of the pagan attitude towards the Emperor in New Testament times will not be entirely out of place.

---

[6] *Cf.* A. Harnack, *Mission u. Ausbreitung des Christentums,* I (4 ed. Leipzig, 1924), p. 430.

[7] See the brilliant discussion in Adolf Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* (1923), pp. 287-324, Eng. tr. L. R. M. Strachan (1927), 338-378, and the full bibliographical notes there given. Deissmann would largely derive the characteristic language of primitive Christianity from the Emperor-cult. Despite the undeniable significance of the use of the same religious terms by Christians

An excellent example is to be found in the word *soter*. From an expression of gratitude by Hellenistic subjects to their God-Kings for deliverance from political or military perils *soter* may be traced to the very basis of Christian worship in the sublime concept of salvation in Christ.[8] As a cult epithet of the Hellenistic Kings it was transferred to the Roman Emperor. In an official inscription of 48 B. C., for example, the town council of Ephesus together with other Greek cities hailed Julius Caesar in his lifetime " the God made manifest, offspring of Ares and Aphrodite, and universal *Saviour* of the life of man." [9] We may note also an Ephesian inscription which declares of Antoninus Pius that " he is saving the entire human race " (*πᾶν τὸ τῶν ἀνϑρώπων ἀνασώζει γένος*).[10] I have selected these two examples from hundreds of such inscriptions. If the Mediterranean world had small salvation, it had an abundance of imperial Saviours. It has often been observed, too, that references to the Saviour in the New Testament take the same form as in imperial inscriptions.

Christ was the " Lord " *(kyrios)* of Christians while the Emperor was the Lord of all who participated in the Emperor-cult. Although in the West the Emperor was called " Lord " (*dominus*) only from the time of Domitian onwards, a full generation after St. Paul, the *kyrios*-title was immediately transferred to the Emperor in the East, together with the point of view it entailed, from his predecessors the Hellenistic mon-

---

and " Caesarians ", Deissmann undoubtedly puts too much emphasis upon the final importance of what he calls " der polemische Parallelismus zwischen Christuskult und Cäsarenkult." *Cf.* also H. Weinel, *Die Stellung des Urchristentums zum Staat* (Tübingen, 1908), pp. 18-23.

[8] Paul Wendland, " Soter," *Zeitschr. f. die neutestamentliche Wiss.*, V (1904), pp. 335-353.

[9] Dittenberger, *Sylloge*^{3}, 760 (II, p. 442).

[10] Th. Mommsen, " Volksbeschluss der Ephesier zu Ehren des Kaisers Antoninus Pius," *Jahreshefte des österr. archäol. Inst.*, III (1900), p. 1 (note lines 17-21 of the inscription).

archs. Among the Jews, however, the Sicarii refused to address the Emperor as Lord.[11] Christians were equally intransigent, and reserved the name *kyrios* for Jesus alone (*cf*. Phil. 2:9-11; 1 Cor. 8:5-6; Jude 4). The martyrdom of Polycarp at Smyrna in 155 A. D. was earned by his refusal to call the Emperor his Lord, for he could not thus blaspheme the Emperor (*basileus*) in heaven.[12] Twenty-five years later Speratus of Scilli in Numidia refused to swear by the genius of the Lord Emperor: he knew not the Empire of this world, and he knew but one Lord, the King of Kings and the Emperor of all peoples.[13] Hundreds of inscriptions, papyri, and ostraca from the three centuries or more of the Emperor-cult are extant to testify to the continuance of the sacred name *kyrios* in the imperial titulature. Although *kyrios* was finally almost eclipsed in official usage by *despotes,* which begins to occur with especial frequency towards the end of the third century,[14] the word survived, nevertheless, as an honorific epithet of the Emperor into the fourth century when it was sometimes so used by the Church Fathers.

The word used in the *koiné* to denote the imperial sovereignty is *basileia,* and *basileus,* unless otherwise qualified, means Emperor.[15] Caesar and Christ, to the latter of whom the title

---

[11] Josephus, *De bello Iudaico*, X, 1 (Bekker-Naber, VI, pp. 180-181).

[12] *Ecclesiae Smyrnensis de martyrio S. Polycarpi epistola circularis*, 8-9 (*PG* 5, 1036AC): O. von Gebhardt, *Ausgewählte Märtyreracten* (Berlin, 1902), pp. 4-5.

[13] *Passio SS. Scilitanorum*, ed. J. A. Robinson, *Texts and Studies,* I: 2 (1891), pp. 112-117. The pertinent section of the text reads, "Saturninus proconsul dixit: 'Et nos religiosi sumus, et simplex est religio nostra, et iuramus per genium domini nostri imperatoris, et pro salute eius supplicamus, quod et vos quoque facere debetis.' . . . 'Sed potius iura per genium nostri imperatoris.' . . . 'Ego imperium huius seculi non cognosco . . . quia cognosco dominum meum, regem regum et imperatorem omnium gentium.'"

[14] Wessely-Wilcken, *Archiv f. Papyrusforschung*, IV (1908), p. 260.

[15] The Emperor's *official* title, however, appears to have remained *Autokrator* until the early seventh century: Louis Bréhier, "L'Origine des titres impériaux à Byzance," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XV (1906), pp. 168-173; *Revue historique*, CXVII (1914), pp. 71-72.

basileus is given, are contrasted in a highly instructive passage in the New Testament where translation has commonly served only to obscure its real meaning. We read thus in Acts 17: 7 of the hostile crowd at Thessalonica, which egged on by the Jews told the politarchs that Paul and Silas " are acting contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that Jesus is *a second Emperor*" (βασιλέα ἕτερον λέγοντες εἶναι Ἰησοῦν). The tone of the reference is contemptuous, of course, but it shows that already in Paul's day Caesar and Christ were recognized by non-Christians as being in some sense rivals for the devotion of mankind.

Despite the parallel usage of religious terms in Christian worship and the imperial cult, Christians were acutely conscious that the tenets of their faith were quite irreconcilable with participation in Emperor-worship. There was a world of difference between " the cult of Caesar and the cult of Christ." In the startlingly Christian sentiments addressed by pagan votaries of the Emperor-cult to their Lord God the Emperor there is often apparent the fervent hope that imperial grace (*charis*) and humanity (*philanthropia*) might improve their social and economic plight.[16] Theirs was a plea to the imperial Saviour to deliver them from the material hardships of this life. The Mediterranean world, nevertheless, in its quest for salvation and the life eternal did not turn to Emperor-worship. Dread of the hereafter or a morbid longing for it enrolled the millions of the Empire in the oriental mystery-cults. No man sought in an hour of peril, we may believe, despite testimony to the contrary from the pagan panegyrists, to save his life or his soul by praying to the *numen* of the Roman Emperor. He knew well enough that the God-Emperor, living or dead, was not consulted about the administration of affairs in the world beyond. The votary of the Emperor-cult prayed, nevertheless, as fervently and audibly as he could to the God-Emperor as the Saviour who should deliver him from economic hardship and from social injustice. Blumenthal believes, for example,

[16] For imperial "grace" and "humanity" and N. T. parallels see Wendland (1904), pp. 349-350.

that the Alexandrians' association of Nero with their *agathos daimon* is to be explained by Nero's having begun his reign with the abolition or diminution of certain taxes.[17]

We cannot discover therefore what Emperor-worship meant to the masses of its devotees merely by describing cult law or by investigating cult administration. The popular mind was no better equipped in antiquity than it is today to follow legal distinctions or to appreciate the significance of religious practice. Unofficial municipal cults were organized in Egypt to worship the living Emperor, and in private documents the living Emperor sometimes received the title *theos*. Whether such usage was strictly in accord with the constitutional theory of the principate—and, of course, it was not—is a matter of small importance;[18] at least one instance of *theos* used of a living Emperor in an official document has been noted.[19] There are, however, certain imponderables to be reckoned with in determining, if it can be done at all, what the popular attitude towards Emperor-worship may have been.

In an early period of Roman religion personified virtues such as *Constantia, Aequitas, Concordia,* and *Victoria* had been minor deities, and during the Empire, under Hellenistic influence, they became associated with the more than human nature of the Emperor. It was as though desirable qualities of the Emperor's own character had been elevated into these minor divinities (as *Constantia Augusti* and *Concordia Augusti*) to which the millions of devotees of the Emperor-cult could pray and in which by his divine permission they could share. Certainly the most precious gift of the Emperor to his subjects was the *Pax Augusti*. An inscription from Halicarnassus says with eloquent simplicity "the sea and the earth are at peace."[20] A deep gratitude for such imperial blessings must indeed have been present in the hearts of humble votaries when they adored the effigy of their Emperor and made supplication with incense and wine (*thure et vino supplicare*). Even so, the difference between the homage rendered by the votary of the official cult to the Emperor and that rendered by a Christian to God was not unlike the distinction we shall find in Origen and others between adoration (*proskynesis*) and true worship (*latreia*). This distinction will be explained when we discuss the Christian attitude towards imperial images.

---

[17] Fritz Blumenthal, "Der ägyptische Kaiserkult," *Archiv f. Papyrusforschung,* V (1913), pp. 330-331.

[18] *Cf.* Blumenthal (1913), p. 328.

[19] *P. Lond.* 1912, 8-9 (Bell, p. 23).

[20] *Anc. Greek Inscr. Brit. Mus.,* 894, 8-9 (IV: 1, p. 63).

When the statement was made above that there was a world of difference between Emperor-worship and Christianity, a very literal meaning was intended. The Christian commonwealth was of another world, and it was this fact that often escaped the votaries of the official cult when they noted with contempt and perplexity the extensive Christian imitation of the technical language of the Emperor-cult. This is what Justin Martyr meant when he wrote in his first apology to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, " You (Emperors) having heard that we are looking forward to an Empire (*basileia*) have injudiciously assumed that we refer to a human Empire (like yours), whereas we mean the Empire of God! " [21]

With regard to the ultimate basis of the Emperor's authority, two very different theories are to be observed throughout the fourth century. They were current indeed throughout the whole period of the later Empire. One was the view of the Roman lawyers and the other the view of the Church Fathers, following the political ideas of the New Testament, modified from generation to generation, as contemporary politics might allow or might necessitate. No extensive citation of texts will be necessary for our present purpose. The legal pagan and the Christian theories both are concisely stated in familiar texts.

The Emperor according to the Roman lawyers was the source of all law for no other reason than that the people by the *lex*

---

[21] Justin Martyr, *Apol. I*, 11 (G. Rauschen, *Florileg. patr.*, fasc. 2, 1904, p. 20).

regia had delegated to him all their own authority. This was the accepted interpretation of the basis of the Emperor's right to rule from the jurist Julianus in the early second century to the Emperor Justinian in the sixth century.[22] "Whatever the Emperor (*princeps*) decides, has the force of law," says Ulpian, "since the people by the *lex regia,* which was passed concerning the *imperium,* have conferred upon him all their own authority and power." [23]

Patristic writers derive the authority of the Emperor from God, of course, and they pay scant attention to the point of view of the Roman lawyers. Justin Martyr in his first *Apology* quotes the admonition to "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's;" while he insists that worship must be reserved for God alone, he says that all Christians are glad to serve the Emperor in other things.[24] The distinction he draws is instructive: worship (*proskynesis* is used as often in the sense of *latreia*) is due to God, but only obedience to the Emperor. A somewhat similar distinction is drawn by Theophilus of Antioch, who accords to God worship (τὸ προσκυνεῖσϑαι) and to the Emperor honor (τὸ τιμᾶσϑαι); Theophilus acknowledges, however, that the imperial authority possesses in a sense the sanction of God, and for that reason Christians were bound to obey the Emperor.[25] Because men did not admit the fear of God, says Irenaeus, God imposed upon them the fear of man himself. Government was not a primitive condition, but has become necessary through the vices and inadequacies of mankind. Men could thus under the restraint of human law attain to some degree of justice. Rulers have been established by God for the benefit of men; sometimes, however, they are the instrument of divine punishment. The Emperor rules by the authority of God, and he should be obeyed.[26]

---

[22] R. W. and A. J. Carlyle, *A History of Medieval Political Theory in the West*, I (1927), pp. 64-70.

[23] Ulpian, *Dig.* I, 4, 1: Mommsen-Krueger (1920), p. 35: "Quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem: utpote cum lege regia, quae de imperio eius lata est, populus ei et in eum omne suum imperium et potestatem conferat." A rescript of Theodosius II and Valentinian III emphasizes that the Emperor (*princeps*) is bound by the laws (*leges*), and that their own authority depends upon the authority of the law (*Cod. Iustinian.* I, 14, 4: Krueger (1915), p. 68). Justinian likewise recalls a century later the ancient *lex regia* by which the Roman people had transferred to the Emperor all their rights and all their power (*Cod. Iustinian.* I, 17. 1, 7: Krueger (1915), p. 70).

[24] Justin Martyr, *Apol. I*, 17 (Rauschen, p. 31).

[25] Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum*, I, 11 (*PG* 6, 1041A).

Christians had recognized the divine basis of imperial authority from the time of St. Paul (Romans 13: 1-7). Imperial rule had no basis in *ius naturale,* for although the Emperor represented God, he was only a man, and there was nothing natural in the subordination of man to man. As St. John Chrysostom, to whose career in its relation to the Emperors Theodosius and Arcadius we shall devote a whole chapter, told his congregation at Antioch after the desecration of the imperial statues, governments (*ἀρχαί*) are either natural (*φυσικαί*) or elective (*χειροτονηταί*), natural as the rule of the lion over the quadrupeds or the eagle over other birds—or elective as the rule of the Emperor over his fellow men: " for he does not rule over his fellow slaves by any natural authority, and therefore he oftentimes loses the *imperium.* Things which do not inhere naturally readily admit of change and transposition." [27]

The Christian view of imperial sovereignty as emanating from God, however, a view indeed shared by non-legal pagan writers, came to exert its influence in Roman law. Justinian speaks of himself as " ruling by authority of God the Empire, which has been entrusted to us by the majesty of heaven." [28] In a novel he states that the fortune (*tyche*) of the Emperor must be exempted from control of the laws, for God has subjected the laws themselves to the Emperor, having sent the latter down to mankind as the living law (νόμος ἔμψυχος).[29] The theory of the ruler as *lex animata* (*nomos empsychos*), however, despite its statement in a novel of the most Christian Emperor Justinian, was rather pagan than Christian; it has an interesting background, which we cannot pursue here, in Hellenistic history.[30] In the fourth century it was a view frequently expounded by the philosopher and rhetorician Themistius. In his oration *On the Humanity of the Emperor Theodosius,* Themistius declares that God had sent down from heaven the imperial power (*basileia*), establishing it on earth, so that mankind might have a refuge from law immovable to the law that breathes and lives.[31]

---

[26] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.*, V, 24 (*PG* 7, 1186-1188).

[27] Chrysostom, *Hom. de stat. VII* (*PG* 49, 93).

[28] *Cod. Iustinian.*, I, 17, 1: Krueger (1915), p. 69: "Deo auctore nostrum gubernantes imperium, quod nobis a caelesti maiestate traditum est . . ." In the following rescript in the Code, Justinian speaks of God as having put the fortune (*fortuna*) of the Emperor above the affairs of men (*Cod. Iustinian.*, I, 17. 2, 8; Krueger (1915), p. 73). It should be noted that the first official formulation of the thesis that Emperors ruled by divine right appears to have come as early as Aurelian (270-275 A. D.): A. D. Nock, *Harvard Theological Review,* XXIII (1930), pp. 263-268.

Eleven imperial panegyrics have survived from the late Empire. The earliest is the *Panegyricus Maximiano Augusto,* which was delivered at Trèves before the Emperor Maximian Herculius on the anniversary of the founding of Rome (April 21, 289 A. D.). Its author is unknown.[32] The latest is the panegyric on the Emperor Theodosius the Great by the rhetorician Latinus Pacatus Drepanius, younger contemporary and friend of the poet Ausonius. We shall consider them both in some detail as illustrating the type of oration being addressed by pagans to the Emperor throughout the fourth century and receiving the official recognition of the Sacred Presence.

---

[29] *Novel.* CV, 2, 4: Schoell-Kroll (1905), p. 507.

[30] See E. R. Goodenough, "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," *Yale Classical Studies,* I (1928), pp. 94-101.

[31] Themistius, *Orat.* XIX, 228a (Dindorf, p. 277); *cf.* also *Orat.* V (*Ad Iovianum*), 64b (p. 76) and *Orat.* XVI (*Ad Theodosium*), 212d (p. 259).

[32] The address was formerly attributed without adequate MS authority to a certain older "Claudius Mamertinus" (under whose name it is printed in the older editions, e. g., *Panegyrici veteres*, London, 1828, III, pp. 1152 ff.) or to a "Mamertinus" (as in W. Baehrens's re-edition of E. Baehrens, *XII panegyrici latini*, Teubner, Leipzig, 1911, pp. 262 ff.). Seeck holds that it is the earliest of eight extant panegyrics by the Gallic rhetorician Eumenius (*PW* 11, 1105).

The panegyrist at Trèves began his address with the flattering suggestion that although on all holidays the most sacred Emperors should be honored no less than the gods, nevertheless, on this most celebrated day, a day most joyous too for the reigning Emperors, the worship of the Emperor's divinity should be joined with the solemn religious observance of the founding of the Sacred City.[33] The statement is then made that although Maximian did not found Rome—that had really been the work of Arcadian Evander, who was honored at Pallanteum, the site of future Rome, by the god Hercules, ancestor of Maximian *(princeps ille tui generis)*—the most sacred Emperor and his brother-in-Empire Diocletian were at any rate to be regarded as co-founders of the Roman Empire (*Romani imperii . . . conditores*), because they were the next best thing, they were its restorers (*estis enim, quod est proximum, restitutores*).[34]

In unctuous periods the orator declares, turning perhaps at this point to ~~Maximian,~~—in whose presence the address was delivered, that he and his fellows should exhaust, if necessary, their lives and their voices in praise-making for the Emperor, for they could all see that he was *a god present among them,* victor over all the world (*qui te praesentem intuemur deum toto quidem orbe victorem*).[35] The orator is at a loss where to begin. He asks whether he should mention the divine birth of Maximian, which was demonstrable both by his immortal deeds and by his name Herculius.[36] The stuff written about Jupiter was fiction, says the panegyrist, but it was true when written about the Emperor![37] Among the glorious attributes of imperial rank there is mentioned " that light which embraces the divine head of the Emperor in a shining orb" (*illa lux divinum verticem claro orbe complectens*), but great as the panegyrist acknowledges all this to be, still the blessings Maximian had bestowed upon mankind were greater—taking to heart the care of such a mighty State, assuming responsibility for the very destiny of all the world (*totius orbis fata suscipere*), and forgetful somehow of self, living but for mankind (*et oblitum quodammodo sui gentibus vivere*). From the pinnacle of his imperial office the Emperor looked down upon all the lands and seas of the earth, noting where there was calm, where there was storm, what judges rivaled his own justice, what governors maintained the glory of his virtue; he received from everywhere countless messengers and dispatched them with as many orders; cities and nations and provinces filled his thoughts; and he passed his days and nights in never-ending attentiveness to the salvation of all men (*noctes omnes diesque perpeti sollicitudine pro omnium salute transigere*).[38] The imperial cult of humanity, so-called, is very much in evidence here.

---

[33] *Panegyricus,* X (II), 1, 1 (W. Baehrens, p. 262) : " Cum omnibus festis diebus, sacratissime imperator, debeat honos vester divinis rebus aequari, tum praecipue celeberrimo isto et imperantibus vobis laetissimo die veneratio numinis tui cum sollemni sacrae urbis religione iungenda est."

[34] *Pan.* X (II), 1, 2-5 (W. Baehrens, pp. 262-63).

[35] *Pan.* X (II), 2, 1 (W. Baehrens, p. 263).

[36] *Pan.* X (II), 2, 2-3 (W. Baehrens, p. 264).

[37] *Pan.* X (II), 2, 5 (W. Baehrens, p. 264).

Such was the staggering task the divine Maximian had taken upon himself. It is interesting to note here that Roman coinage of the last decade of the third century employed the labors of Hercules symbolically to portray the efforts of Maximian in behalf of the Empire.[39] Jupiter and Hercules were the divine prototypes of the God-Emperors Diocletian and Maximian respectively, and this correspondence between sovereignty in heaven and on earth is not unlike the celestial and imperial duality that we shall see the Fathers of the fourth century constantly emphasizing.

After an adulatory review of the military careers of Maximian and Diocletian, the panegyrist declares, "Fortunate art thou, O Rome, in such Emperors—fortunate, I say, and now more fortunate by far than under your Remus and your Romulus!"[40]

---

[38] *Pan.* X (II), 3, 2-4 (W. Baehrens, p. 265).

[39] H. Mattingly, *Cambr. Anc. Hist.* XII (1939), p. 330.

[40] *Pan.* X (II), 13, 1 (W. Baehrens, p. 273): "Felix igitur talibus, Roma,

After Theodosius had defeated the usurper Maximus, the learned rhetorician Pacatus went to Rome to congratulate the Emperor upon his victory. The address which he delivered in Theodosius's presence in the Curia at Rome was exactly a century later than the panegyric on Maximian, and in the course of this century (289-389 A. D.) both the Emperor and the Empire had passed from paganism to Christianity. The custom, however, of taking cognizance of the Emperor's divinity in an official panegyric had in no wise been abandoned. The most Christian Emperor Theodosius appears to have heard himself called a God with no less pleasure than Maximian, persecutor of Christians. Having given an extravagant description of Spain, the home of Theodosius, Pacatus pompously informed the Roman Senate, which was for the most part Christian by this time,[41] that Spain had given them *the God whom they saw in their midst* (*deum dedit Hispania quem videmus!*).[42]

Pacatus represents the triumph of sycophancy over self-respect. He regards the Emperor as the partner of God (*deus consors*), and he will not hesitate to say what it is right (*fas*) for a man to understand and to say. Pacatus sees in Theodosius a God " who is worshipped by mankind, to whom prayers are addressed in private and in public throughout all the world, from whom a sailor seeks a calm sea, a traveler a safe return, a warrior an auspicious victory" *(qui gentibus adoratur, cui toto orbe terrarum privata vel publica vota redduntur, a quo petit navigaturus serenum, peregrinaturus reditum, pugnaturus auspicium)*.[43] Pacatus in fact refers to God with some condescension as sharing in the Majesty of Theodosius, and suggests a fatuous parallel between the assistance the fates are said

---

principibus . . . felix, inquam, et multo nunc felicior quam sub Remo et Romulo tuis."

[41] So St. Ambrose had declared in the summer of 384 A. D. (*Ep.* XVII, 9: *PL* 16, 1004A).

[42] *Pan.* II (XII), 4, 5 (W. Baehrens, p. 93).

[43] *Pan.* II (XII), 6, 4 (W. Baehrens, pp. 94-95).

to render to God and the divine force that prompts the Emperor's memory when he speaks.[44]

Pacatus brings his fulsome address to a close by congratulating himself on having made the journey from Gaul to Rome, and he is overwhelmed when he contemplates his own importance, for now he will be able to tell the envious throngs back home, "I saw Rome, I saw Theodosius, and I saw them both together! I saw the father of an Emperor; I saw the avenger of an Emperor; I saw the restorer of an Emperor!"[45]

The Emperor is addressed or referred to in the pagan panegyrics of the fourth century as *sacratissimus,*[46] *sanctissimus,*[47] *beatissimus,*[48] *invictus* and *invictissimus,*[49] *aeternus,*[50] *perpetuus,*[51] *benignissimus,*[52] *prudentissimus,*[53] *indulgentissimus,*[54]

---

[44] *Pan.* II (XII), 18, 4 (W. Baehrens, p. 105): "An, ut illi maiestatis tuae participi deo feruntur adsistere fata cum tabulis, sic tibi aliqua vis divina subservit, quae quod dixeris scribat et suggerat?"

[45] *Pan.* II (XII), 47, 5 (W. Baehrens, p. 130): "O mea felix peregrinatio! O bene suscepti et exhausti labores! quibus ego intersum bonis! quibus paror gaudiis! quae reversus urbibus Galliarum dispensabo miracula! quantis stupentium populis, quam multo circumdabor auditore, cum dixero: 'Romam vidi, Theodosium vidi, et utrumque simul vidi; vidi illum principis [Honorii] patrem, vidi illum principis [Gratiani] vindicem, vidi illum principis [Valentiniani iunioris] restitutorem!'"

[46] *Pan.* V (VIII), 1, 1 (W. Baehrens, p. 187); 1, 3 (p. 188); 2, 2 (p. 189). *Pan.* VI (VII), 1, 1 (p. 200). *Pan.* VII (VI), 1, 1 (p. 220). *Pan.* X (II), 1, 1 (p. 262); 1, 5 (p. 263); *et passim.*

[47] *Pan.* III (XI), 12, 2 (W. Baehrens, p. 140); 18, 3 (p. 144); 31, 1 (p. 155); 32, 3 (p. 156).

[48] *Pan.* IV (X), 1, 1 (W. Baehrens, p. 157); 2, 3 (p. 157); 5, 5 (p. 161); 38, 6 (p. 187).

[49] *Pan.* VI (VII), 1, 4 (W. Baehrens, p. 201). *Pan.* VIII (V), 1, 1 (p. 232); 2, 2 (p. 233); 3, 2 (p. 234); 9, 6 (p. 238); 13, 4 (p. 241); 14, 2 (p. 241). *Pan.* X (II), 1, 4 (p. 263), *et passim.*

[50] *Pan.* VII (VI), 2, 2 (W. Baehrens, p. 221); 11, 5 (p. 229); 12, 1 (p. 229). *Pan.* VIII (V), 3, 1 (p. 234); 13, 3 (p. 241).

[51] *Pan.* VIII (V), 20, 1 (W. Baehrens, p. 246).

[52] *Pan.* IV (X), 21, 2 (W. Baehrens, p. 172).

[53] *Pan.* IV (X), 24, 1 (W. Baehrens, p. 174).

[54] *Pan.* IV (X), 26, 5 (W. Baehrens, p. 177).

praestantissimus,[55] *maximus,*[56] *nobilissimus,*[57] and *dominus.*[58] Deceased Emperors are *divi,*[59] and constant reference is made to the *numen*[60] of the Emperor. Most of these epithets, but not all of them, will be found applied to Emperors by Church Fathers of the fourth century.[61] The chief difference, however, between the pagan and Christian use of titles, as we shall have more than one occasion to observe, lies in the fact that certain titles of cult significance (*aeternitas, numen,* etc.), while very common in the pagan literature of the period, occur very rarely or not at all in Christian literature.[62]

---

[55] *Pan.* IV (X), 27, 6 (W. Baehrens, p. 177).

[56] *Pan.* IV (X), 3, 1 (W. Baehrens, p. 158); 6, 2 (p. 161); 6, 3 (p. 162); *et passim.*

[57] *Pan.* IV (X), 3, 4 (W. Baehrens, 159); 38, 2 (p. 186).

[58] *Pan.* VIII (V), 13, 3 (W. Baehrens, p. 241). *Pan.* IX (IV), 6, 1 (p. 251).

[59] *Pan.* III (XI), 3, 2 (W. Baehrens, p. 133); 9, 2 (p. 137). *Pan.* V (VIII), 4, 2 (p. 190).

[60] *Pan.* V (VIII), 1, 4 (W. Baehrens, p. 188). *Pan.* VI (VII), 1, 4 (p. 201). *Pan.* X (II), 1, 1 (p. 262).

[61] *Cf. sub vocc. citt.* A. Engelbrecht, *Das Titelwesen bei den spätlateinischen Epistolographen* (Vienna, 1893), pp. 53-59, and M. B. O'Brien, *Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography* (Washington, D. C., 1930), pp. 9, 166. It happens, however, that some of these titles were not used in letters, and so are not listed by Engelbrecht or O'Brien (e. g. *prudentissimus,* which occurs frequently in Lucifer of Calaris's addresses to the Emperor Constantius, but which by some mischance seems not to be used to the Emperor in any extant patristic letter from either the fourth or fifth century).

[62] O'Brien, *op. cit.,* p. 18, is mistaken in saying that Augustine, *Ep.* LXXXVIII, 2 (*CSEL* 34: 2, p. 408, 1. 13), used *numen* in addressing the Emperor. The word actually occurs in a letter addressed by a certain Anulinus, *vir clarissimus,* to Constantine the Great apparently in 313 A. D., two generations before Augustine; it is quoted in a letter sent to the Donatist Bishop Januarius by the Catholic clergy of Hippo (and hence has been preserved in Augustine's correspondence). Since this is the sole source Sister O'Brien cites anywhere in her study for the use of *numen* addressed by a Christian to the Emperor, although she mentions *numen* as an imperial title several times (pp. 9, 17-18, 162, and 166), I assume the word should be deleted from her lists of titles of the Emperor. Although *numen* is applied to the Emperor in Christian legal literature (e. g. *Codex Theodosianus,* XV, 4, 1: Mommsen, p. 818), my notes do not reveal, and I cannot recall, finding

In the extensive Christian apologetic literature produced before the Christianization of the Empire (Quadratus, Aristides, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Melito, Apollinaris, Miltiades, Theophilus, *Epistle to Diognetus* (c. 1-10), Clement, Origen, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Arnobius, Lactantius), it was only to be expected that at least some defenses of Christians and their religion should be addressed to the Emperors. But the significant fact is that almost all the early apologists addressed works to the Emperors. In addition to charges of atheism, hideous stories of incest, child murder, and cannibalism—or as the learned Athenagoras declared in his apology to Marcus Aurelius, " denial of divinity, feasts of Thyestes, and the intercourse of Oedipus " [63]—such stories which are familiar enough to modern readers from the well known refutations of them in Tertullian and Minucius Felix were widely circulated against Christians during the second century. Although such slander was not the cause of what persecution there was by the State (which was rather the Christian refusal to accept the divinity of the Roman Emperor), allegations of this sort, nevertheless, contributed to the wide-spread prejudice against Christians and were a source of constant danger to them. But the Emperor was the source of all law and justice, and the first apologists sought to acquaint the Emperor with the terrible injustices being done them. The apologists were at great pains, however, to point out that the very accusations brought against Christians were prominent in the mythologies of the oriental and Graeco-Roman religions. The address to the Emperor, therefore, often became less an appeal for mercy and justice in the name of a common humanity than a very didactic exposition of Christian doctrine and a contrast of the falseness and gross immorality of paganism with the truth and nobility of Christianity. We may thus

---

it anywhere addressed by a Father to an Emperor. Further, contrary to the impression given by Sister O'Brien, p. 16, Augustine does not address the title *maiestas vestra* to the Emperor in his correspondence (her sole example of Augustine's using the title also occurs in the letter of Anulinus to Constantine).

[63] *Libellus pro Christianis,* 3 (Schwartz, 4). *Cf. ibid.,* 31-35 (pp. 41-46).

note a *genre* of Christian apologetic literature addressed directly to the Emperors. Most of it does not improve in quality as we pass from the second to the fourth century. Whatever the norm of comparison, whether religious, philosophical, or literary, certainly the works of Aristides, Justin Martyr, and Athenagoras are superior to the productions of Arnobius, Lactantius, and Firmicus Maternus.

The apology of Quadratus is extant only in a single sentence quoted by Eusebius, from whom we understand that it was addressed to the Emperor Hadrian during his first winter in Athens (125-126 A. D.).[64] It would appear from an emended entry in the *Chronicon Paschale* that Aristo of Pella may have addressed an apology to Hadrian in the year 134 A. D.[65]

Eusebius, further, makes vague mention of an apology to Hadrian by Aristides, "a faithful follower of our religion." [66] The address of the Athenian philosopher Marcianus Aristides is extant and, it would appear, in its entirety, although up to half a century ago it was believed to be lost.[67] Whether Eusebius is right in saying that Quadratus addressed his apology to Hadrian is not evident, but it is certain that Aristides' work was addressed to Antoninus Pius, whose full name is preserved in the Syriac version of the work.[68] Something is to be learned from the apology of Aristides about his attitude towards the Emperor. Since he regarded with contempt the idolatrous practices of barbarians and of Greeks alike,[69] and insisted that Christians "did not worship idols in the form of man," [70] we may safely assume that Aristides like his Christian contemporaries must have refused to participate in the Emperor-cult. A few years later Theophilus of Antioch, a contemporary of Aristides, answered the question, "Why do you not worship the Emperor?" with the reply that the Emperor was not made to be worshipped, but to be honored, for he was not a god, but a man appointed by God—not to be worshipped, but to judge justly.[71]

---

[64] Eusebius, *Chron.*, *Olympiad.* 226 (*PG* 19, 557-558; Helm, *GCS* 24, p. 199); *H. E.*, IV, 3 (*PG* 20, 308AB: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, pp. 302, 304).

[65] *Chron. Paschal.*, *Olympiad.* 228, A. D. 134 (*PG* 92, 620A). If the passage is to be historical at all, the emendation of Fabricius (*D. C. B.*, I, p. 161) must be adopted.

[66] Eusebius, *H. E.*, IV, 3 (*PG* 20, 308B: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, p. 304).

[67] In the spring of 1889 Mr. J. Rendel Harris discovered a Syriac version of apparently the whole of the apology of Aristides to Antoninus Pius, which he published with an English translation and fragments of an Armenian version in the Cambridge *Texts and Studies*, I: 1 (1891 and 1893), pp. 1-64. By an astonishing coincidence Prof. J. Armitage Robinson, editor of the series, after reading the proof of Mr. Harris' translation, happened to read portions of the religious romance of Barlaam and Josaphat, which from the eleventh century at least has been associated with the name of St. John of Damascus. Robinson noted that the speech of Nachor to King Abenner in the romance (*cf. Vita Barlaam et Joasaph*, 26-27: *PG* 96, 1108A-1124B) bore a striking resemblance to Aristides' apology to the Emperor, and subsequent investigation revealed that the author of the romance had with slight adaptation incorporated Aristides' apology into his story (*Texts and Studies*, I: 1, pp. 67-80). *Cf.* E. Hennecke, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, IV: 3 (1893), and R. Raabe, *ibid.*, IX: 1 (1892). See also the earlier but invaluable researches of Harnack, *Die griechischen Apologeten des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, *ibid.*, I: 1-2 (1882), pp. 100-114.

Aristides is careful, it would seem, not to refer to the character of imperial authority and the limitations thereon in Christian eyes. A similar restraint was practiced for the most part by other second century apologists. There was no need to be impolitic. There was a great need not to be impolitic. Aristides' chief purpose was to defend Christianity against the vicious calumnies current in his day, as we have observed, and to discredit as much as possible to the Emperor the religions of barbarians, Jews, and Graeco-Romans. In his discussion of the errors of idolatrous worship, however, Aristides by implication rejects as stupid the apotheosizing of deceased Emperors by the Senate.[72] "Whatsoever creates," he says, "must be greater than whatever is created." [73] Athanasius will say much the same thing in much the same words two centuries later in an attack upon Emperor-worship.

---

[68] J. R. Harris (1891), pp. 6-19.

[69] Aristides, *Apol.*, 3 (Harris, p. 37: Greek text in Robinson, p. 101).

[70] *Ibid.*, 15 (Harris, p. 48: *cf.* Robinson, pp. 110-11).

[71] Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum*, I, 11 (*PG* 6, 1041A).

[72] Aristides, *Apol.* 7 (Harris, pp. 39-40: Robinson, p. 103).

[73] *Ibid.*, 3 (Harris, p. 37: Robinson, p. 101).

In his first apology to the Emperors Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Lucius Verus, Justin Martyr declared that he did not think it improper to make reference to the ridiculous apotheosis by order of the Emperor Hadrian of his favorite Antinous, " who lived in our own time, and whom all were prompt through fear to worship as though he were a god, although they knew both who he was and what his origin had been." [74] Athanasius in his attack upon Emperor-worship likewise looked with scorn upon the deification of this young man, " who wasn't even respectable."

Melito, Bishop of Sardis, is credited by Eusebius with an " apology for our faith which he addressed to the Emperor Verus " (i. e. Marcus Aurelius).[75] Eusebius quotes three fine passages from Melito's petition to the Emperor, in the longest of which the simultaneous emergence of Christian doctrine and imperial authority is emphasized: " And this is the greatest proof of the fact that it was for the good that our doctrine flourished alongside of the Empire in its fortunate beginning: from the time of the principate of Augustus no evil has befallen, but, on the contrary, all things have been splendid and glorious in accordance with the prayers of all." [76] This happy alignment of Church and State had in the past been disrupted, declares Melito, only by Nero and Domitian, although once more persecution of Christians was beginning. It is clear, however, that Eusebius quotes the passage because it is in accord, as we shall see, with his own earnest desire for peace between Church and imperial State.

We shall find passages very similar to the quotation from Melito in the works of certain Fathers of the fourth century, notably Eusebius himself and Gregory Nazianzen, who both insist that Christianity and imperial government, from their first appearance at about the same time, have been interdependent upon each other. But there are other resemblances between the apologists and the Fathers. Aristides, Justin Martyr, Melito, and Athenagoras — like Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Liberius, and even Athanasius and Ambrose on occasions—adopt very courteous and conciliatory language to the Emperors. In the second century, as well as in the fourth, churchmen exhibit a strong desire to get along with the State, which means with the Emperor. The apologists, especially Justin Martyr, for example, are careful to employ the official titulature in addressing the Emperors.[77] The expressed attitude of Athenagoras towards Marcus Aurelius and Commodus is best described as flattering. The apologists commonly ascribe great piety and justice to the Emperors. They seem to have felt that if the Emperors could but be persuaded of their possession of these fine qualities they might be tempted to show them in dealing with Christians.

---

[74] Justin Martyr, *Apol. I*, 29 (Rauschen, p. 45). *Cf.* Eusebius, *H. E.* IV, 8 (*PG* 20, 321B-324A: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, p. 314).

[75] Eusebius, *H. E.*, IV, 13 (*PG* 20, 337A: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, pp. 330, 332).

[76] Melito in Eusebius, *H. E.*, IV, 26 (*PG* 20, 396A: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, pp. 384, 386).

There was also extant in Eusebius's day a discourse by Claudius Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius.[78] About the same time another Christian apologist named Miltiades, about whom very little is known, "addressed a defense of the philosophy which he followed to the rulers of this world" (πρὸς τοὺς κοσμικοὺς ἄρχοντας).[79] The reference can only be to the Emperors (Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus), and it is thus that both St. Jerome and Eusebius's translator, Rufinus, understood it.[80]

About 177 A. D. the Athenian philosopher Athenagoras addressed in behalf of his fellow Christians an intercessory plea (πρεσβεία περὶ χριστιανῶν) "to the Emperors Marcus

---

[77] Justin Martyr, *Apol. I*, 1 (Rauschen, pp. 6-7).

[78] Eusebius, *Chron.*, *Ol.* 237 (*PG* 19, 562: Helm, *GCS* 24, p. 206); *H. E.*, IV, 26 (*PG* 20, 392A: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, p. 380).

[79] Eusebius, *H. E.*, V, 17 (*PG* 20, 476A: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, p. 472).

[80] *Cf.* Harnack, *Griechische Apologeten* (1883), pp. 281-282.

Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus, conquerors of Armenia and Sarmatia, and, most of all, philosophers." [81] A large proportion of these second century apologies to Emperors was apparently addressed to Marcus Aurelius. The reason for this fact, I daresay, is explained by Athenagoras's dedication to the Emperor: he was, "most of all, a philosopher." From an Emperor whose reputation for piety and justice was so great Christians of the day might well expect much.

Athenagoras is very respectful indeed to the philosophical Emperors. He addresses them as "mighty sovereigns" (μεγάλοι βασιλέων),[82] "greatest, most humane, and most learned of sovereigns" (οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ φιλανϑρωπότατοι καὶ φιλομαϑέστατοι βασιλέων),[83] "most great Emperors" (μέγιστοι αὐτοκράτορες).[84] An interesting aspect of Athenagoras's attitude towards the Emperors is his constant recognition of their surpassing knowledge of all things. This is doubtless because they were such great philosophers. "But you know these things perfectly well, since you are well taught in philosophy and all learning *(paideia)*." [85] "But you also are quite familiar with these things, since you are well versed in all matters and are beyond other men acquainted with the ancients." [86] "What need is there, in speaking to you who have pushed into every field of knowledge, to mention the poets or to investigate other beliefs?" [87] He begs these imperial scholars, however, at the outset of his address to listen to him impartially, and "not to be carried away by common foolish talk and so prejudge our case," but to apply their desire of knowledge and their love of truth to an examination of the Christian doctrine.[88]

---

[81] The best edition of the text is by Eduard Schwartz, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, IV: 2 (1891), pp. 1-47: it is printed under the traditional Latin title (*Legatio pro Christianis*) with the translation of Conrad Gesner in *PG* 6, 889-972.

[82] *Libellus pro Christianis*, 1 (Schwartz, p. 1).

[83] *Ibid.*, 2 (Schwartz, p. 3).

[84] *Ibid.*, 2 (Schwartz, p. 4); *cf. ibid.*, 18 (p. 20).

[85] *Ibid.*, 2 (Schwartz, p. 3).

[86] *Ibid.*, 17 (Schwartz, p. 18).

[87] *Ibid.*, 24 (Schwartz, p. 31).

The whole Empire under the intelligent sway of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus enjoys profound peace according to Athenagoras. With admiration of the mildness and gentleness of the Emperors and their peaceful and benevolent disposition towards all men, individuals live in possession of equal rights. But Christians are harassed, plundered, and persecuted; they do not share in the blessings of the Empire, although "of all men they are most piously and righteously disposed both towards the Deity and towards your government."[89] It devolves as a duty, therefore, upon the Emperors to stop by law this unjust treatment.[90]

Athenagoras employs the same argument against image-worship that we found in Aristides,[91] and like the latter he does not explicitly mention obeisance to imperial images, but we cannot fail to hear what he does not say. Images of the Emperor were everywhere to be seen, but in their frequent attacks upon idolatry the Christian apologists often confined themselves to showing how stupid was "the worship of idols in the form of man" and to proving from history how pagan gods were only men deceased.[92] Although Athenagoras protests to the Emperors that "it is not my intention to show the fallacy of idols,"[93] he devotes much of his address to that purpose and asserts that it is demons (*daimones*) who lure men to idols and sacrificial offerings, "but the gods that please the multitude, and whose names are given to the images, were men, as we can prove from their history."[94] That men were motivated to idolatrous worship by demons was the common belief of Christians under the Empire; neither Aristides nor Athenagoras, however, makes explicit reference to Emperor-worship, but it must have been uppermost in their minds, if not because they were addressing the Emperors, then because of the ubiquity of imperial effigies. We shall soon meet idolatrous worship explained by demonology in an excursus on the Christian attitude towards obeisance to the Emperor's image in an interesting passage from a little known Christian dialogue of the fourth century. The reader may judge for himself the tone of Athenagoras's discourse from its ending: " But do you, who are entirely and in all things, by nature and by education (*paideia*), upright and moderate and humane, and worthy of imperial authority . . . do you incline your imperial head in approbation (τὴν βασιλικὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπινεύσατε). For who can with greater justice receive what they petition you for than we who pray for your sovereign rule, in order that from father to son in accordance with the strictest demands of justice you may receive the imperial power, and that your rule may increase and progress until all men are subject to your sway. But this is to our advantage, too, that we may lead a peaceful and a quiet life, and willingly perform all the services commanded of us." [95] It is important to note here, I think, the Christian apologist's reference to hereditary succession in accordance with the strictest demands of justice (κατὰ τὸ δικαιότατον), his prayer for the further expansion of the (heathen) Emperor's rule, and his recognition of the value of that rule, which he prayed might bring peace and quiet to Christians.

---

[88] *Ibid.*, 2 (Schwartz, p. 4).

[89] *Ibid.*, 1 (Schwartz, p. 2).

[90] *Ibid.*, 2 (Schwartz, p. 3).

[91] *Ibid.*, 15 (Schwartz, pp. 15-16).

[92] *Ibid.*, 28 (Schwartz, pp. 36-38).

[93] *Ibid.*, 18 (Schwartz, p. 20).

[94] *Ibid.*, 26 (Schwartz, p. 34).

---

[95] *Ibid.*, 37 (Schwartz, p. 47).

CHAPTER II

EUSEBIUS AND CONSTANTINE THE GREAT

Eusebius of Caesarea was born about 260 A. D. He lived through difficult years of persecution in Palestine, where it was particularly severe. He suffered imprisonment and witnessed the martyrdom of his friend and teacher Pamphilus. Eusebius was in his middle forties when the persecution of Diocletian began; after that he must have watched with trembling anticipation the decade of rivalry between Constantine and Licinius when the future of the Church in Palestine seemed to be at stake. But it was Constantine who emerged sole master of the Roman world, and in the eyes of Eusebius, whatever the qualifications modern historians may care to make, he was the first Christian Emperor. Eusebius became the close friend and adviser of Constantine; he supported the Emperor's desire for peace in the Church, and to Eusebius peace was desirable for the Church at any price. If subordination of Church to Emperor and State was to be the price of peace, what matter? It was to be subordination to a Christian Emperor and a Christian State. It was a subordination which to Eusebius meant proper guidance and protection, and protection for a Church bruised by persecution, distraught by heresy, and yet withal having a future of untold possibilities, was what then seemed most necessary. Eusebius was emphatic in asserting that Constantine was God's chosen emissary to rescue the Church from persecution; he believed that Constantine should be received and reverenced as the deliverer of the Saints. He did not, however, realize that by accepting Constantine's claim to control over Bishops, precedents were being established that would prove dangerous to the Church in the hands of Constantius. Eusebius was an unconscious supporter of caesaropapism.

Eusebius was almost forty years older than Athanasius; when they met as opponents at Tyre in 335 A. D., Eusebius had about five years more to live, but there were thirty-eight years before Athanasius, the years that brought him the trials and achievements that made him great. An important change is to be observed in the Fathers' attitude towards the Emperor between the time of Eusebius and his contemporaries and Athanasius and his contemporaries. We shall discuss it in connection with Athanasius, but it is well to bear in mind that a reaction lies ahead as we investigate Eusebius's relations with Constantine and his acceptance of the Emperor's right to dictate to the Church. The relation of Church and State before the conversion of Constantine was simple enough; the Church was a voluntary society of intractable persons to whom it was sound policy for the State to be hostile. The Church was independent and refused to recognize that the civil authority could have any voice in spiritual matters; as for the State, it refused in a sense even to recognize the existence of the Church. A discussion of the separation of Church and State before the advent of Christianity would have been unthinkable; to the mind of antiquity up to the time of Christ religion and statecraft had been indissolubly united. With the Christianization of the Empire, however, and the growing power of the universal Church the question arose whether the Church was in the State or the State was in the Church.

A century or so after Eusebius published his *Panegyric on Constantine* and his *Life of Constantine,* a Greek lawyer named Socrates wrote a continuation of the *Ecclesiastical History.* In the preface to his work Socrates states that Eusebius "in writing the life of Constantine was evidently more intent on an elaborate encomium of the Emperor than an accurate statement of fact."[1] This is entirely just criticism, and yet Eusebius warns the reader that only what is good in the Emperor's career will be treated in the *Life.*[2] In the face of such an acknowledgment of purpose the criticism of Socrates—and of

---

[1] Socrates, *H. E.*, I, *prooem.* (*PG* 67, 33A).

[2] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini,* I, 10-11 (*PG* 20, 921C-925A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, pp. 11-13).

Gibbon—is almost pointless. Just as imperial panegyrists like Eumenius, Nazarius, Claudius Mamertinus, and Pacatus served throughout the fourth century as propaganda ministers, so to speak, for the Emperors they eulogized, telling the Emperors what the latter wished their subjects to hear and to read and to remember, so Eusebius in his works on Constantine fulfills a similar function. The *Life of Constantine* is clearly an effort to convince the Roman world that the time had come for rule by a Christian Emperor. Eusebius and his fellows were aided no little in their purpose by the Emperor's character. Constantine was a man of great force. It must have been hard to look upon him with impartial eyes, for while he earned the extravagant admiration of Eusebius, he was accorded in later generations the scornful ridicule of Julian and the bitter hostility of Zosimus. The panegyrist Nazarius declares that Constantine towered as high above his imperial predecessors as the latter had towered above private citizens.[3] That is a point of view to which Eusebius could have heartily subscribed.

Eusebius is important for the bulk of his work. In the *Historia ecclesiastica* alone well over one hundred documents and passages from other writers, not elsewhere extant, are quoted, but as an historian Eusebius cannot be ranked very high. His facts are frequently erroneous; his quotations from sources are often unintelligibly mutilated; his prejudices set the character of his interpretations. He lacks insight; he is exceedingly dull. He seems to be burdened with an erudition which he cannot assimilate. But this very mediocrity of mind and Christian prejudice can be turned to account, for he is probably thinking much the same thing that his Christian contemporaries were thinking, just as he commonly wrote what the writers who preceded him had written. His attitude towards the Emperor is thus peculiarly important, for there is evidence for the belief that his attitude was typical for the most part of that of Bishops of his day.

---

[3] *Panegyricus* IV (X), 1, 1 (W. Baehrens, p. 156).

Eusebius, for example, informs us himself that during the celebration of Constantine's *tricennalia,* after the Church of the Holy Sepulchre had been dedicated, " the divine qualities of the Emperor's character continued to be *the theme of universal praise.*" But one of the assembled churchmen, clearly not Eusebius himself, went so far in Constantine's presence as to call him " blessed " (*makarios*), inasmuch as he had been regarded as worthy to hold absolute sovereignty in this life and in the world to come was destined to share the Empire of heaven with the Son of God. Constantine indignantly rebuked his eulogiser.[4] The historian Theodoret declares that the great Eustathius of Antioch had been the first to speak at Nicaea and that he had " crowned the Emperor's head with the flowers of praise " (*τοῖς ἄνϑεσι τῶν ἐγκωμίων τὴν βασιλέως ἐστεφάνωσε κεφαλήν*).[5] The sole dissenter among Christians contemporary with Eusebius from regarding the Emperor as of quasi-divine character, whether for purposes of flattery or otherwise, was probably Donatus, as far as the extant literature allows us to perceive, but even then the rigidly orthodox St. Optatus of Milevis attacked him and explicitly asserted the supremacy of the Emperor and the imperial State over the Church.

Eusebius probably began to write his *Historia ecclesiastica* in 305 A. D. He seems to have reached the end of book V about November of 308, and to have finished book VI after February of 310. Books VII and VIII appear to have been written in May of 311, or shortly thereafter, and the first recension of the *History* was published with a supplement on the *Martyrs of Palestine* towards the end of 311. Late in 313 or early in 314 Eusebius revised the text of books I-VIII, adding book IX, while a third edition was published in 325 (before Nicaea), in which the text was again revised and book X added.[6] Such is in brief the textual history of the *Historia*

---

[4] *Vita Constantini*, IV, 48 (*PG* 20, 1200A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 137).

[5] Theodoret, *H. E.*, I, 6 (7) (*PG* 82, 917D-920A: Parmentier, *GCS* 19, p. 32).

[6] H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton, *Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History and Martyrs of Palestine*, II (London, 1928), pp. 2-11.

ecclesiastica as we have it today. The dates should be noted, and it is important to observe that the work was twenty years in the writing. An interesting change in Eusebius's attitude towards the Emperor Licinius occurred during the period in which Eusebius wrote the *History*.

In book IX of the *History* Licinius is spoken of in the same breath with Constantine, and he is "honored for understanding and piety" (*συνέσει καὶ εὐσεβείᾳ τετιμημένος*); he is "beloved of God" (*θεοφιλής*),[7] and is a "patron of peace and piety" (*ὁ τῆς εἰρήνης προήγορος καὶ εὐσεβείας*).[8] In the Tyrian panegyric, delivered by Eusebius probably before October of 314 A. D. in honor of Paulinus, the Emperor Licinius is still ranked with Constantine, and they are "the most exalted Emperors of all" (*οἱ πάντων ἀνωτάτω βασιλεῖς*),[9] "supreme rulers" (*οἱ ἀνωτάτω βασιλεύοντες*), and "most beloved of God" (*θεοφιλέστατοι*).[10] When Licinius begins to persecute Christians, Eusebius's attitude towards him, as we should expect, changes completely. He who had been beloved of God becomes "hated of God" (*θεομισής*);[11] the patron of peace and piety becomes a lewd, plundering "hater of mankind" (*μισάνθρωπος*) and a "drunken old dotard" (*ἐσχατόγηρως . . . ἐμπαροινῶν*).[12]

Eusebius describes with some gusto the wicked careers of Emperors who oppressed the Church,[13] and he recounts with obvious satisfaction the horrible deaths of imperial persecutors.[14] One calls to mind immediately Lactantius's pamphlet *De*

---

[7] Eusebius, *H. E.*, IX, 9 (*PG* 20, 820B: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, p. 826).

[8] *Ibid.*, IX, 9 (*PG* 20, 829A: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, p. 838).

[9] *Ibid.*, X, 4 (*PG* 20, 856A: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, p. 867).

[10] *Ibid.*, X, 4 (*PG* 20, 872CD: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, p. 879).

[11] *Ibid.*, X, 8 (*PG* 20, 897A: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, p. 894).

[12] *Ibid.*, X, 8 (*PG* 20, 900 A: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, p. 896). It is noteworthy that in his revisions of the *History* Eusebius did not expunge the earlier laudatory references to Licinius, although there is extant a shorter version of the text which seems to be tampered with in IX, 9, but the abridged reading in which Licinius's name is deleted is accepted by Schwartz, p. 826.

[13] *Ibid.*, VIII, 14 (*PG* 20, 781-788: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, pp. 778-786).

[14] *Ibid.*, VIII, 16 (*PG* 20, 789B: Schwartz, *GCS* 9, pp. 788-790); IX, 9

mortibus persecutorum, which was written in 313-314 (Harnack) or 318-320 (Monceaux), and so dates from about the same time as the *Historia ecclesiastica* of Eusebius. The construction Lactantius puts upon imperial history is well known, but we should pause a moment to consider it. God visited terrible punishment upon those princes who had persecuted Christians,[15] while He had spared and succoured those who had avoided shedding Christian blood. Lactantius like Eusebius is singularly well informed in all the details of God's relations with the Emperors, but after the marvelous triumph of the Christian cause under Constantine hesitancy to press his interpretation to its logical conclusion must have seemed to Lactantius little short of criminal scepticism.

We learn from Lactantius that Severus, whom Diocletian had looked upon as "a dancer and drunk, who turns night into day and day into night" (*saltatorem temulentum ebriosum, cui nox pro die est et dies pro nocte*),[16] died by opening his veins.[17] Maximian ended his detestable life by ignobly hanging himself.[18] Galerius died by a terrible disease which devoured him while his limbs wasted away in putrefaction.[19] Diocletian contracted a disease in the twentieth year of his reign that left him intermittently insane;[20] finally subjected to the most contumelious treatment, he came to hate life, and starved himself to death amid abject and painful circumstances.[21] Maximin Daia poisoned himself, suffered dreadful torment for four days, and finally dashed his head against the wall, blinded himself,

---

(821ABC: Schwartz, pp. 828-830); IX, 10 (836BCD-837A: Schwartz, pp. 846-848); *Supplementum libri octavi* (796A: Schwartz, p. 796). *Cf. Vita Constantini*, I, 23, 59.

[15] Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum,* 1 (Brandt, *CSEL* 27, pp. 171-173).

[16] *Ibid.*, 18 (*CSEL* 27, p. 194).

[17] *Ibid.*, 26 (*CSEL* 27, p. 203).

[18] *Ibid.*, 30 (*CSEL* 27, p. 208).

[19] *Ibid.*, 35 (*CSEL* 27, p. 214).

[20] *Ibid.*, 17 (*CSEL* 27, pp. 191-192).

[21] *Ibid.*, 42 (*CSEL* 27, pp. 221-222).

and breathed out his guilty soul in awful death.[22] The *De mortibus persecutorum,* as the (modern) title indicates, is a record of imperial misfortunes, in his judgments of which Lactantius's hatred vies with his incontinence; in this respect his attitude towards the Emperors will be found to have something in common with that of Lucifer of Calaris.

Eusebius delivered his panegyric on Constantine (*De laudibus Constantini*) in the imperial palace at Constantinople during the celebration of the Emperor's *tricennalia.* The pious Emperor listened attentively, and appeared to be in an ecstasy of delight; he acknowledged his pleasure later to Bishops whom he was entertaining.[23] This was the second speech Eusebius had made in the Emperor's presence. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem had been dedicated not long before, and Eusebius had rendered Constantine a lengthy discourse on the Holy Sepulchre. On that occasion the Emperor had insisted upon standing while the truths of religion were being expounded; he had said that the sermon was not too long, and had requested Eusebius to finish what he had to say.[24] It is interesting to note that his father Constantius Chlorus had similarly stood during the official panegyric which Eumenius (?) had delivered in his presence in the summer of 297 A. D., so that the orator had been obliged to make his address a short one (*habenda est ratio temporis, Caesare stante, dum loquimur*).[25]

Eusebius begins his panegyric with the assurance that he intends to avoid any display of rhetoric and to be guided by the precepts of wisdom. The Bishop believes that the Emperor is a human being set apart from other human beings in that he is "perfect in wisdom, in goodness, in justice, in courage, in piety, in devotion to God: the Emperor truly and he alone is a philosopher, for he knows himself, and he is fully aware that an abundance of every blessing is showered on him from a source quite external to himself, even from heaven itself." [26] Eusebius, and the gentle Gregory of Nyssa after him, regards these as the "imperial virtues" (*basilikai aretai*).[27] In the Emperor's soul is a knowledge of things divine as well as of things human; everything about the Emperor excites wonder, although the multiplicity of his mundane perfections falls short of his more divine qualities.[28]

---

[22] *Ibid.*, 49 (*CSEL* 27, p. 234).

[23] *V. C.*, IV, 46 (*PG* 20, 1197B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, pp. 136-137).

[24] *Ibid.*, IV, 33 (*PG* 20, 1181BC: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 130).

[25] *Pan.* VIII (V), 4 (W. Baehrens, p. 235).

The parallelism between Christ and the Emperor reached in both the art and the literature of the early fourth century a point beyond which it was scarcely possible to go with any semblance of propriety. Throughout the *Panegyric* Eusebius uses imperial epithets of God and divine epithets of the Emperor to indicate their close resemblance one to the other. We note that Christ is "great Emperor" (μέγας βασιλεύς),[29] "all-imperial God" (παμβασιλεύς),[30] and "Sovereign of the entire world" (τοῦ σύμπαντος καθηγεμὼν κόσμου).[31] He is "the Emperor of the universe" (ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ὅλων),[32] and heaven is "the Empire beyond" (ἡ ἐπέκεινα βασιλεία)[33] and "the highest Empire" (ἡ ἀνωτάτω βασιλεία).[34] The law of God is "imperial law"

---

[26] Eusebius, *De laudibus Constantini*, 5 (*PG* 20, 1336C: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 204).

[27] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PG* 20, 1336A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 203). *Cf.* Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio consolatoria in funere Pulcheriae* (*PG* 46, 865D).

[28] *De laud. Constant., prolog.* (*PG* 20, 1317B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 195): "θείων γὰρ καὶ ἀνθρωπείων σοφίας οὔσης καὶ ἐν βισιλέως ψυχῇ . . . πάντα γὰρ τὰ βασιλέως καλά, πλὴν ἔτι λειπόμενα τῶν θειοτέρων."

[29] *Ibid.*, 15 (*PG* 20, 1413B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 244). For the relation of Christ and the Emperor in Christian art and architecture of the fourth century consult: Johannes Kollwitz, *Römische Quartalschrift*, XLIV (1936); E. Peterson, *Catholica*, V (Paderborn, 1936); Richard Krautheimer, *Review of Religion*, III (1939); André Grabar, *L'Empereur dans l'art byzantin* (Paris, 1936).

[30] *De laud. Constant.*, 3 (*PG* 20, 1329A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 201); 5 (1337A: Heikel, p. 204).

[31] *Ibid.*, 1 (*PG* 20, 1324B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 198).

[32] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PG* 20, 1336A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 203); 11 (1376A: Heikel, p. 223).

[33] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PG* 20, 1336A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 203).

[34] *Ibid.*, 1 (*PG* 20, 1324C: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 199); 4 (1333C: Heikel, p. 203); 5 (1337A: Heikel, p. 204).

(*βασιλικὸς νόμος*),[35] and the heavens are "imperial domiciles" (*βασιλικοὶ οἶκοι*).[36] Constantine's Empire is "the imitation of the monarchical power in heaven" (*τὸ μίμημα τῆς μοναρχικῆς ἐξουσίας*) ;[37] "the Emperor is one, image of the one all-imperial God" (*ὁ δ' ἐξ ἑνὸς εἷς βασιλεύς, εἰκὼν ἑνὸς τοῦ παμβασιλέως*).[38] Truly God had been cast in the image of the Roman Emperor.

Eusebius does not presume to instruct Constantine in the sacred mysteries, for the latter has been personally "made wise by God" (*ὁ ἐκ ϑεοῦ σεσοφισμένος*).[39] Constantine has consciously modeled the imperial government on earth after that in heaven: "Invested as he is with a semblance of heavenly sovereignty, he directs his gaze above and frames his earthly government according to the pattern of that divine original, feeling strength in its conformity to the monarchy of God. . . . And surely monarchy far transcends every other constitution and form of government, for that democratic equality of power, which is its opposite, may rather be described as anarchy and disorder."[40] This is an important passage. It gives us an insight into Eusebius's attitude towards the imperial authority and a clear idea of his preference in politics. He believes that a single imperial government is necessary to the peace and prosperity of the world, and he associates the unity of the one true faith with the unity of imperial government. The countless woes of history have been due to the delusion of polytheism. He beholds with wonder the simultaneous emergence of the Christian faith and the imperial sovereignty: "two roots of blessing, the Roman Empire and the doctrine of Christian piety (*ἥ τε Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ εὐσεβὴς διδασκαλία*), sprang up together for the benefit of men."[41] The historical interrelation of these two phenomena similarly impressed other Fathers in the fourth century, Gregory of Nazianzus, for example, who claimed for the Emperor Constantius, curiously enough, a clear insight into these matters and their significance.[42] The alignment of Emperor and God had brought according to the Fathers profound peace to the whole world.

---

[35] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 20, 1332A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 201).

[36] *Ibid.*, 1 (*PG* 20, 1320B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 197).

[37] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PG* 20, 1336B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 204).

[38] *Ibid.*, 7 (*PG* 20, 1357A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 215).

[39] *Ibid.*, 11 (*PG* 20, 1376A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 223).

[40] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 20, 1329B-1332A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 201).

[41] *Ibid.*, 16 (*PG* 20, 1424A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 249).

Not the least interesting aspect of Eusebius's attitude towards the Emperor is that he assumes personal and direct communication between God and Emperor. He would not dare presume to teach the God-instructed Emperor, but he would like to learn from the Emperor whatever messages from heaven the latter might choose or might be allowed to reveal. " You yourself," he suggests to Constantine, " it may be, will vouchsafe at a time of leisure to relate to us the abundant manifestations which your Saviour has accorded you of his presence, and the oft-repeated visions of himself which have attended you in the hours of sleep. I speak not of those secret suggestions which have not been revealed to us, but rather of those principles he has instilled into your mind, and which are of general interest and benefit to the human race. . . ." [43] It should be observed, however, that this closeness to God that is Constantine's unique possession among men is due rather to his own personality and character than to his position as Emperor. Eusebius insists that Constantine attaches small value to earthly sovereignty. Applause, flattery, military power and pomp, robes of purple and of gold—at these he smiles, and he clothes his soul with a knowledge of God and the Christian virtues.[44] Constantine regards earthly sovereignty as but a petty and fleeting dominion over a mortal and temporary existence; he reckons it as little better than the goatherd's, shepherd's, or herdsman's power; flattery and acclamation annoy rather than please him.[45] The Emperor is the exemplar of true piety, and is displayed by God for all mankind to look upon (εὐσεβείας τε ἀληϑοῦς ὑπόδειγμα τοῖς ἐπὶ γῆς ἅπασιν ἀποφαίνων). The Emperor like the radiant sun illuminates the most distant subjects of his Empire through the presence of the Caesars as well as by the far-piercing rays of his own splendor.[46] Constantine is truly worthy of his exalted station. But whoever is without these blessings of character, whoever denies the Emperor of the universe, and does not invest himself with the virtues that befit an Emperor, but overlays his soul with moral deformity and baseness, whoever substitutes the fury of a wild beast for the clemency of an Emperor (βασιλικὴ ἡμερότης), the incurable venom of malicious wickedness for a generous temper, folly for prudence, that recklessness which is the most odious of all vices for reason and wisdom—anyone abandoned to such vices as these, however he may be thought powerful through the violence he has exercised as a tyrant (τυραννικὴ βία), has no true claim to the title of Emperor.[47] Eusebius emphasizes that imperial rule can be a blessing only when the character of the Emperor is good. How can a man be lord and master of the world (ἄρχων καὶ τῶν ὅλων κύριος), who is the slave (δοῦλος) of countless cruel masters, the slave of low delights and unbridled lust, the slave of ill-gained riches, of rage and passion, of cowardice and terror, of ruthless demons and of soul-destroying spirits. But Constantine is truly Emperor, "Lord of Self" (αὐτοκράτωρ ἀληϑῶς οὗτος); he is truly Victor (νικητής), for he has triumphed over those passions which subdue the rest of mankind.[48] This appraisal of the character of Constantine is most instructive. It is scarcely consistent with what we know from other sources.[49] It is what Eusebius wished the Roman world to believe was the character of the Christian Emperor; it is Eusebius's ideal of what an Emperor should be, and as such it will be seen to have much in common with the ideal that Synesius of Cyrene urges upon the Emperor Arcadius at the end of the century.

---

[42] Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.* IV (*Adv. Iulian. I*), 37 (*PG* 35, 564AB). It is worth noting, however, that St. Augustine did not approve of the extension of imperial domination (*regni latitudo*) to the point that it embraced the world in a single corporate State (see *De civitate Dei,* V, 12: Welldon, I, pp. 170-171).

[43] *De laud. Constant.*, 18 (*PG* 20, 1437D-1440A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 259).

[44] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PG* 20, 1337B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 205).

---

[45] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PG* 20, 1337A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 205).

[46] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 20, 1329AB: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 201).

[47] *De laud. Constant.*, 5 (*PG* 20, 1336AB: Heikel, *GCS* 7, pp. 203-204).

[48] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PG* 20, 1336BC: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 204). In the *Life of Constantine* Eusebius dilates again and again upon the Emperor's possession of the Christian virtues (*V. C.*, I, 43, 45; II, 13; IV, 1-4, 31, 54).

Eusebius is impressed with the fact that Constantine, unlike all his imperial predecessors, had been the friend of God the *Pambasileus,* and that he furnished to all men a glorious example of the pious life. Constantine was therefore especially honored by God with manifold blessings and a reign of thirty years.[50] Constantine was victorious in arms by the grace of God.[51] Eusebius is the chief source for the famous story, which he says Constantine himself had told him, of the cross of light in the heavens with the legend "Conquer by this" and the adoption of the labarum as the standard under which the imperial armies should march.[52] All the peoples of the Empire hailed Constantine as "the victorious, the pious, and their common benefactor" (*ὁ καλλίνικος, ὁ θεοσεβής, ὁ κοινὸς εὐεργέτης*), for all acknowledged that he had shone forth "a common blessing to mankind by the grace of God" (*κοινὸν ἀγαθὸν ἀνθρώποις ἐκ θεοῦ χάριτος*).[53]

Terms of address and of reference to the Emperor are as a whole not so numerous in Eusebius as they are in Athanasius;

---

[49] *Cf.* Aurelius Victor, *Epit. de Caes.*, 41 (Pichlmayr, p. 167): "At Constantinus obtento totius Romani imperii mira bellorum felicitate regimine Fausta coniuge, ut putant, suggerente Crispum filium necari iubet. Dehinc uxorem suam Faustam in balneas ardentes coniectam interemit, cum eum mater Helena dolore nimio nepotis increparet. Fuit vero ultra quam aestimari potest laudis avidus . . . habitum regium gemmis et caput exornans perpetuo diademate."

[50] *Vita Constant.*, I, 3-5 (*PG* 20, 916B-917A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, pp. 8-9). *Cf. ibid.*, IV, 74-75 (1228C-1229B: Heikel, p. 148).

[51] *Ibid.*, I, 6 (*PG* 20, 917B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, pp. 9-10).

[52] *Vita Constant.*, I, 28-31 (*PG* 20, 944B-948A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, pp. 21-22). *Cf. ibid.*, I, 40 and III, 2.

[53] *Ibid.*, I, 41 (*PG* 20, 956B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 27).

Eusebius prefers to expand into a period of several cola what he might have compressed into a single adjective. The conventional titles of address occur in abundance, but they give little idea of the extravagant nature of his discourses. Constantine is " our victorious Emperor " (*ὁ καλλίνικος ἡμῶν βασιλεύς*),[54] " Emperor most beloved of God " (*βασιλεὺς ὁ θεοφιλέστατος*),[55] "Emperor dear to God" (*ὁ τῷ θεῷ φίλος βασιλεύς*),[56] and "Victor" (*νικητής*).[57] He is addressed as " Sire " (*βασιλεῦ*) [58] and as " victorious and mighty Constantine " (*νικητὰ Μέγιστε Κωνσταντῖνε*).[59] The humanity of Constantine is emphasized and his benefactions (*φιλάνθρωπος καὶ εὐεργετικός*).[60] The sons of Constantine are " lovers of God " (*φιλόθεοι καίσαρες*),[61] and by the virtue of their piety (*θεοσεβείας ἀρετῇ*) have been proclaimed Emperors, Augusti, Sovereigns (*αὐτοκράτορες αὔγουστοι σεβαστοὶ βασιλεῖς*).[62] God had honored the blessed Emperor with divine honors during his lifetime (*Θεὸς . . . αὐτὸν . . . τὸν μακάριον θεοπρεπέσιν ὑψώσας τιμαῖς*).[63] As for Constantine, he had exhorted his subjects to the virtuous and holy life, raising his voice for all the world to hear " like some interpreter of Almighty God " (*οἷά τις ὑποφήτης τοῦ παμβασιλέως θεοῦ*).[64]

---

[54] *De laud. Constant.*, 1 (*PG* 20, 1320C: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 197).

[55] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 20, 1329A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 201).

[56] *Ibid.*, 1 (*PG* 20, 1324C: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 199); 5 (1333C: Heikel, p. 203). *Cf. Vita Constant.*, I, 41 (*PG* 20, 956B: Heikel, p. 26); III, 43 (1104B: Heikel, p. 96).

[57] *De laud. Constant.*, 7 (*PG* 20, 1357B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 215). *Cf.* 5 (1336C: Heikel, p. 204).

[58] *Ibid.*, 18 (Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 259: the text differs in *PG* 20, 1437D).

[59] *Ibid.*, 11 (*PG* 20, 1376A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 223).

[60] *Vita Constant.*, I, 43 (*PG* 20, 957A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 27) ;I, 50 (964D: Heikel, p. 31).

[61] *De laud. Constant.*, 1 (*PG* 20, 1321A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 197).

[62] *Vita Constant.*, I, *prooem.* (*PG* 20, 912B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 7).

[63] *Ibid.*, I, 9 (*PG* 20, 921B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 11). *Cf.* I, 11 (924D: Heikel, p. 13), *et passim.*

[64] *De laud. Constant.*, 10 (*PG* 20, 1373A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 222).

Few historians have left Eusebius without characterizing him a servile flatterer; he may have been so, but he was something more. Both the *Panegyric* and the *Life of Constantine* were written when Eusebius was in his middle seventies, and he had reached an eminence in this world beyond which he could not hope to advance. The *Life,* furthermore, was published after the death of Constantine; one does not flatter a dead man to secure preferment from him, and his references to the sons of Constantine are such as to subordinate them to the latter, and nowhere do they exceed the terms of conventional address; his references to them are even rather tame in comparison with Athanasius's own references to the Emperors Constans and Constantius. There is nothing self-seeking about Eusebius's flattery; he believed what he said, or at any rate he thought it well for his readers to believe it. But he could be firm enough with the imperial family. There is extant a very sensible letter from Eusebius to Constantia, sister of Constantine and wife of Licinius, rebuking the Empress for wishing to procure an *eikon* of Christ. There is no trace of flattery here, no suggestion of subservience; quite the contrary.[65]

Eusebius says with reference to Constantine's claim to be a " Bishop ordained by God to overlook what is external to the Church " that his measures corresponded to his words, " for he watched over all his subjects with an episcopal care, and exhorted them as best he could to follow the pious life." [66] It is obvious enough from Eusebius's detailed account of Constantine's relations with the Bishops at Nicaea that he recognized the Emperor's right to call an ecumenical council and to preside over the assembled Bishops.[67] Constantine, says Eusebius, " confirmed and sanctioned the decrees of the council " (*τὰ τῆς συνόδου δόγματα κυρῶν ἐπεσφραγίζετο*).[68] This was in general the

[65] Eusebius, *Ep. ad Constantiam Augustam* (*PG* 20, 1545-1549).

[66] *Vita Constant.*, IV, 24 (*PG* 20, 1172AB: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 126).

[67] *Ibid.*, III, 6, 10, 12-13, 21-24.

[68] *Ibid.*, III, 23 (*PG* 20, 1084C: Heikel, *GCS* 7, pp. 88-89).

Christian attitude towards the Emperor throughout the reign of Constantine. It was at first the attitude of Athanasius, for example, and marks his relations with the Emperor during the whole of his earlier career until the final break with Constantius during his third exile.[69] With an Augustan wiliness, Constantine had been outwardly deferential to the Bishops at Nicaea. He even wrote on one occasion to the churches of the Empire that whatever was determined in the holy assemblies of Bishops should be regarded as indicating the will of God.[70] Indeed, had Constantius been as diplomatic as his father, he might never have provoked the resistance of Athanasius, whose ideal, as we shall see, was an independent Church protected by the God-given Emperor. In Constantius's insistence, however, upon asserting his authority over the Church *de iure,* as well as *de facto,* seems to me to lie the chief cause of the change in the attitude of Christian churchmen towards Emperor and imperial State after the sixth decade of the fourth century.

But the attitude of Eusebius (and his contemporaries) towards the Emperor lasted beyond the time of Athanasius and appears most strikingly in St. Optatus of Milevis in Numidia, a contemporary of the Emperors Valentinian I and Valens. Optatus launched an attack upon the Donatists a generation before St. Augustine and seems to have been pretty much absorbed in the problems of doctrine and church polity which demanded attention in the Africa of his day (he gives at any rate no attention to the Athanasian controversy of a decade or more before the time he wrote).[71] The Emperor Constantius despite the stir he caused among the Athanasians is not even mentioned by Optatus, but his brother Constans is *deum timens,*

---

[69] *Cf.* K. F. Hagel, *Kirche und Kaisertum in Lehre und Leben des Athanasius* (diss. Tübingen, 1933), pp. 51-54.

[70] *Vita Constant.*, III, 20 (*PG* 20, 1080A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 87).

[71] Athanasius's name does not appear in Optatus's sole work *De schismate Donatistarum,* ed. Ziwsa, *CSEL* 26 (1893), and Arius is condemned in a single sentence (*op. cit.*, IV, 5: *CSEL* 26, p. 109).

religiosus, misericors,[72] as well as *christianus imperator.*[73] Julian, of course, is *imperator profanus et sacrilegus.*[74] In Optatus we find a supporter of imperial erastianism. He responds to Donatus's insolent question, "What has the Emperor to do with the Church?" (*ille solito furore succensus in haec verba prorupit*: "*quid est imperatori cum ecclesia?*") [75] with the reminder that St. Paul (1 Tim. 2:2) had urged all Christians to pray for the Emperors and the imperial authorities in the interests of a happy and a tranquil life with them. St. Paul was right, declares Optatus; the Emperor should receive the prayers of Christians even if he be a pagan (*etiamsi talis imperator esset qui gentiliter viveret*).[76] He asserts that the State is not in the Church, but that the Church is in the State, that is, the Roman Empire (*non enim respublica est in ecclesia, sed ecclesia in republica, id est in imperio Romano*).[77] Optatus rebukes Donatus for having believed that he had held the government of Carthage and observes that since God alone is above the Emperor, for He made him Emperor, while Donatus was vaunting himself above the Emperor, as though he had become something more than human, he was virtually regarding himself as God rather than as a human being in this failure to reverence the Emperor, who after God was most feared by men.[78] According to Eusebius and Optatus then the Roman Emperor was less than God and something more than man.

---

[72] *De schismate Donatistarum*, III, 3 (*CSEL* 26, p. 74).

[73] *Ibid.*, III, 3 (*CSEL* 26, pp. 80, 81).

[74] *Ibid.*, II, 17 (*CSEL* 26, p. 51).

[75] *Ibid.*, III, 3 (*CSEL* 26, p. 73). Elsewhere Optatus, I, 22 (pp. 25-26), in answer to the Donatist queries, *quid christianis cum regibus? aut quid episcopis cum palatio?*, states that the earlier Donatists themselves (*maiores vestri*) had addressed petitions to Constantine, of which the following is an example: *Rogamus te, Constantine, optime imperator . . . petimus ut de Gallia nobis iudices dari praecipiat pietas tua* (they asked for judges from Gaul because of that province's freedom under Constantius Chlorus and Constantine himself from the persecution and contentions of their own Africa). By such an appeal the Donatists, however, *eo ipso* acknowledged that the Emperor "had something to do with the Church."

[76] *Ibid.*, III, 3 (*CSEL* 26, p. 74).

[77] *Ibid.*, III, 3 (*CSEL* 26, p. 74).

---

[78] *Ibid.*, III, (*CSEL* 26, p. 75): "Carthaginis principatum se tenuisse crediderat; et cum super imperatorem non sit nisi solus deus, qui fecit imperatorem, dum se Donatus super imperatorem extollit, iam quasi hominum excesserat metas, ut prope se deum, non hominem aestimaret non reverendo eum, qui post deum ab hominibus timebatur."

CHAPTER III

CONSTANS AND THE EARLY YEARS OF CONSTANTIUS

When the sons of Constantine divided the world "like an inheritance from their father" (πατρικὴ ὕπαρξις),[1] they also came by the respect and honor which Christians had accorded to the great Emperor. They were doubly honored, both as Christian Emperors and as sons of the first Christian Emperor. The attitude of Eusebius is to a large extent reflected in the extreme deference shown by Christians to the Emperor in the generation after Constantine. It was not until the later career of Athanasius, during the period of his third exile, as we shall see, that marked opposition on the part of Christians is to be found in the language addressed or employed in reference to the Emperor. It was then also that the obligations and limitations of the imperial office came rather to be emphasized than the glory and sanctity of that office. After the confusion which followed Constantine's death, three Augusti had emerged;[2] they furnished a parallel on earth to the Trinity in heaven. Within three years, however, Constantine II died (340 A. D.), and his brothers Constans and Constantius shared the Empire until the death of Constans in 350 A. D.

It was sometime during this decade, most probably between 346-350 A. D., that the Christian Senator Julius Firmicus Maternus addressed to the Emperors Constans and Constantius the violent polemic *De errore profanarum religionum.* From this work we are able to learn something of the Emperor's place in Christian lay thought of the middle of the fourth century. Before we turn to the *De errore,* however, we should consider Firmicus's attitude towards the Emperor as shown in his *Mathesis,* an astrological manual in eight books, which according to Mommsen was composed between the years 334-337 A. D.[3] It has been commonly accepted that when the *Mathesis* was written, Firmicus must have been a pagan, and that conversion to Christianity must have preceded the tract against paganism.[4] There are, nevertheless, passages in the *Mathesis* that seem to indicate considerable acquaintance with Christianity, notably the prayers at the beginning of the fifth and seventh books.[5] In any event Firmicus's remarks on the Emperor in the *Mathesis* are much too significant to be omitted from the present study.

---

[1] Eusebius, *Vita Constant.*, IV, 63 (*PG* 20, 1220A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 144).

[2] *Ibid.*, IV, 68 (*PG* 20, 1224B: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 146).

In one passage Constantine the Great is referred to as "son of the deified Constantius" *(Constantinus . . . divi Constantii filius)*.[6] It is interesting to note in this connection that *divus* is found on contemporary Christian tombstones. The word does not appear in Christian usage before the time of Constantine, however, for when death was not infrequently the price which Christians paid for refusing to accept the *consecratio divorum,* it was but natural that they should refrain from recording in the date-marks of their funerary *tituli* an expression which might be said to imply a superstitious acceptance of imperial divinity.[7] After the recognition of Christianity as a *religio licita* under Constantine, the expression *Divus Augustus* begins to appear, and several examples have survived from the fourth century.[8] But Firmicus is clearly not using *divus* merely as an honorary epithet, for elsewhere in the *Mathesis* he emphasizes the divinity of the Roman Emperor.

---

[3] Th. Mommsen, "Firmicus Maternus," *Hermes*, XXIX (1894), p. 468.

[4] This is the view of Clifford H. Moore, *Julius Firmicus Maternus, der Heide und der Christ* (Munich, 1897), who established beyond dispute the Firmican authorship of both the *Mathesis* and *De errore.*

[5] See F. Skutsch, "Ein neuer Zeuge der altchristlichen Liturgie," *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, XIII (1910), pp. 291-305, who was opposed not too convincingly in his analysis of the prayers as Christian by P. Wendland, "Zwei angeblich christliche liturgische Gebete," *Nachr. d. Götting. Ges. d. Wiss.*, 1910, pp. 330-334, who sees a Stoic origin, while an attempt has been made to reconcile the opposing views by Ed. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (1923), pp. 233-39, who sees orientalized Platonism as the background of the prayers. For a discussion of the chronological relationship of the *Mathesis* and *De errore*, not in agreement with Mommsen's dating of the former work, see Lynn Thorndike, *History of Magic and Experimental Science* (1923), I, pp. 525-538; *Class. Phil.*, VIII (1913), pp. 415-435.

[6] *Math.*, I, 10, 13 (Kroll and Skutsch, I, 37). I accept Boll's reading in *PW* 6, 2366. Kroll and Skutsch, however, give *divi Constantini filius*, the MS reading. The word *divus* appears only this once in the *Mathesis* and not at all in the *De errore.*

Constantine the Great is hailed as the restorer of liberty to the Roman world, one whom the fortune of war has never failed, and the master of the world amid a happiness occasioned and ever increased by the moderation of his rule.[9] Firmicus addresses a prayer to the planets that they may yield to the judgment of God on high who has decreed everlasting *imperium* to Constantine and his sons and may bring it about that these latter may " rule over our posterity and the posterity of our posterity through infinite succession of ages, so that when all the bitterness of evil has been removed, the human race may gain the boon of quiet and of everlasting happiness." [10]

In his discussion of the character and training of the astrologer Firmicus insists that interrogations on the condition of the State or on the life of the Roman Emperor must never be made. In fact, whenever *haruspices* are questioned by laymen on the condition of the Emperor and are desirous of answering their questioner, the upper entrails are invariably convulsed by an intricate tangling of the arterial system, although these organs were designed for prognostication. Firmicus regards this as especially significant. No astrologer could possibly determine anything true about the Emperor's fate, *for the Emperor alone is not subject to the motions of the stars*; he is unique, and in his fate the stars have no power to decree the end. For since he is lord of all the world, his fate is governed by the judgment of God on high, and because the earthly span of all the world lies subject to the Emperor's power, he too has been set up in the number of those gods whom the principal divinity has established to make and to preserve all things.[11] It is this divine interrelationship that confounds the *haruspices,* for whatever divinity they invoke, inasmuch as it has less strength, will not be able to undo the substance of that greater strength that is in the Emperor. To him all free men, all the social orders, all the wealthy, all nobles, all honors, all powers are subject: the power of divine will and of immortal freedom are his lot, *and he is placed in the chief ranks of the gods.*[12]

---

[7] De Rossi, *Inscriptiones christianae*, I (1861), *Prolegomena*, p. X.

[8] The following Emperors are "deified" in Christian inscriptions given in De Rossi, *Inscr. christ.*, I (1861-67): Julian (no. 164), Jovian (nos. 172, 174, and 175), and Valentinian III as late as 455 A. D. (no. 767). Deceased Emperors are often called *divi* in the Theodosian and Justinianean Codes.

[9] *Math.*, I, 10, 13 (Kroll and Skutsch, I, 37-38).

[10] *Math.*, I, 10, 14 (Kroll and Skutsch, I, 38).

Before Firmicus wrote the *Mathesis,* during the period of its composition, and after its publication, it would seem to have been a work forbidden by law, a manual for a profession actually proscribed by imperial mandate. Eleven imperial *constitutiones* from the fourth century survive in the Theodosian Code, condemning in violent terms all occult scientists;[13] these laws were directed chiefly against frauds and charlatans, to be sure, but they forbade in sweeping terms commerce with all diviners, soothsayers, and astrologers (*magus vel magicis contaminibus adsuetus, maleficus, haruspex, hariolus, augur, mathematicus*).[14] Firmicus had, nevertheless, no cause for anxiety in the publication of the *Mathesis*; he had already published two works on astrology,[15] and he contemplated another.[16] The fourth century was an age in which almost everyone, pagan and Christian alike, dabbled in astrology. But we must note that in his excursus on the divinity of the Emperor (*Mathesis*, II, 30, 5-6) Firmicus appears to be departing from the customary interests of the astrologer. At any rate in the representative excerpts from astrological works of the Roman and Byzantine Empires published in the appendices of the several volumes of the *Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum* there is no similar exemption of the Emperor from stellar influence anywhere to be found. As a matter of fact, the astrologer Hephaestion of Thebes, who wrote about 381 A. D., incorporated in the third book of his astrological compendium an elaborate *genitura* of the Emperor Hadrian,[17] which he had drawn from a work by Antigonus of Nicaea (*fl.* about 200 A. D.), while the Byzantine astrologer Leo the Philosopher records the technique of " how it is possible to learn how long Emperors (*Basileis*) and Magistrates (*Archontes*) will rule, and what will happen during their period of power." [18] There is no reason, so far as I can discover, to assume that the elevation of the Roman Emperor to " the chief ranks of the gods " could have been suggested by the current astrological sources from which Firmicus compiled his work, and the unctuous presentation is too characteristically Firmican to be merely a chance incorporation from another source. The phraseology does suggest, however, a background of Neo-Platonic thought.[19] This deification of the Emperor is not entirely consistent, nevertheless, with the prayer at the beginning of the fifth book of the *Mathesis,* in which the astrologer addresses God as "sole ruler and prince of all, sole Emperor and Lord" (*solus omnium gubernator et princeps, solus imperator et dominus*).[20] Franz Skutsch believed that this prayer, together with the prayer opening the seventh book, was inspired by Christian liturgical formulae, and he concluded that Firmicus was either a Christian when he wrote the *Mathesis* or was at least familiar with Christianity.[21] The tendency to think of God in terms of the Emperor has often been noted in this study; suffice to say it had become most marked about the time when Firmicus was writing.

---

[11] *Math.,* II, 30, 5 (Kroll and Skutsch, I, 86): "Sed nec aliquis mathematicus verum aliquid de fato imperatoris definire potuit; solus enim imperator stellarum non subiacet cursibus et solus est, in cuius fato stellae decernendi non habeant potestatem. Cum enim fuerit totius orbis dominus, fatum eius dei summi iudicio gubernatur, et quia totius orbis terrenum spatium imperatoris subiacet potestatibus, etiam ipse in eorum deorum numero constitutus est, quos ad facienda et conservanda omnia divinitas statuit principalis."

[12] *Math.,* II, 30, 6 (Kroll and Skutsch, I, 86): "[imperatori] enim omnes ingenui, omnes ordines, omnes divites, omnes nobiles, omnes honores, omnes serviunt potestates, divini numinis et inmortalis sortitus licentiae potestatem in principalibus deorum ordinibus collocatur."

[13] *C. Th.* IX, 16, 1-11 (Mommsen, pp. 459-463).

[14] *C. Th.* IX, 16, 6 (Mommsen, p. 461).

---

[15] *Math.*, IV, 20, 2 (Kroll and Skutsch, I, 258) ; *ibid.*, VII, 7, 4 (II, 229).

[16] *Math.*, V, 1, 38 (Kroll and Skutsch, II, 18) ; *ibid.*, VIII, 1, 10 (II, 283) ; *ibid.*, VIII, 4, 14 (II, 293).

[17] *Catal.* VI, pp. 67-71. The attractive suggestion advanced by Engelbrecht (1887) and accepted by Bouché-Leclercq and Boll that Hephaestion of Thebes was a Christian is no longer tenable after the material made available by the publication of part 2 of *Catal.* VIII (1929) ; a note by H. J. Rose, " Hephaistion of Thebes and Christianity," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXXIII (1940), pp. 65-68, summarizes the evidence and arguments for and against the Christianity of Hephaestion, and convincingly concludes that he could not have been a Christian.

[18] *Catal.* IV, p. 92. *Cf.* the fragment in *Catal.* VII, p. 150.

It would appear that Firmicus's perfervid apotheosis of the Emperor was designed rather for the latter's own attention than as a deterrent to the astrologer who might attempt to cast an imperial horoscope. It is hard to say whether the deification of the Emperor might not to some extent have had as its purpose the desire to take the curse off a work unlikely to meet publicly with imperial approbation, however much the Emperor might peruse the work in private. But it was certainly an effective form of flattery. As a Roman Senator Firmicus had doubtless more than once heard official panegyrics delivered in the Sacred Presence, and the panegyrists Eumenius, Nazarius, Mamertinus, and Pacatus, as well as the court poets Ausonius and Claudianus, make similar assertions of imperial divinity.

It is not known whether Firmicus actually delivered his polemic *De errore profanarum religionum* before the Emperors Constans and Constantius themselves, or whether he may have sent them each a copy of the address. But if he did speak in the Sacred Presence, he probably addressed only one of the Emperors in person. From the time of Diocletian it had been the custom, although one spoke before but a single Emperor, to include his colleagues in the address. The Emperors personified the Empire, so to speak, and although there might be several Emperors, attention could be called by such a fiction of rhetoric to the indivisibility of the Empire.[22] Thus the panegyrist at Trèves in 289 A. D. expressed it well when he told Maximian with reference to the latter and to Diocletian that although they added to the imperial Majesty by their double divinity, nevertheless they preserved the effectiveness of a single *imperium* by their mutual understanding.[23]

---

[19] *Cf.* in general Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig, Berlin, 1923), pp. 233-239.

[20] *Math.*, V, *praef.*, 3 (Kroll and Skutsch, II, 2); *cf. ibid.*, VII, 1, 2-3 (II, 208-209).

[21] Skutsch, *Archiv f. Religionswiss.*, XIII (1910), pp. 291-305.

Although Firmicus gives in the *Error of Profane Religions* a euhemeristic interpretation to myths relating to the formation of the Graeco-Roman pantheon, his attack upon the latter is much less severe than that upon the oriental nature-religions and mystery-cults. The reason for this is doubtless that the national religion of Rome had lost its spiritual significance three centuries before, and in the fourth century was surviving chiefly in the works of the poets, artists, and antiquarians.[24] Boll has suggested that the Graeco-Roman religion was thus spared because of its association with the State and above all with the Emperor.[25] This is highly probable, but it is more likely that Firmicus had less desire to fight windmills than Arnobius and Lactantius.

In his denunciation of paganism Firmicus further reveals his attitude towards the Emperor, but his estimate does not on the whole seem to be so spectacular as in the *Mathesis*. He declares that the Empire must be preserved from the fatal disease of polytheism. Pagans must be saved from destruction by imperial legislation, no matter how stout the resistance they offer to their own salvation. Firmicus tells the Emperors that it was for this purpose that God on high entrusted them with the Empire (*ad hoc vobis deus summus commisit imperium*).[26] Firmicus likens the devotees of the pagan religions to those who are sick. Constans and Constantius should be Emperor-physicians of the spiritual ills of the Empire.[27] Firmicus's attitude here has something in common with the orthodox patristic view that one of the more important of the Emperor's functions should be the preservation of the orthodox faith from heresy.

---

[22] G. Boissier, *La fin du paganisme*, II (1891), p. 184, n. 1. *Cf.* Gilbert Heuten, *Travaux de la faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Bruxelles*, VIII (1938), p. 26.

[23] *Pan.* X (II), 11, 2 (W. Baehrens, p. 271): "quamvis maiestatem regiam geminato numine augeatis, utilitatem imperii singularis consentiendo retinetis."

[24] Paul Allard, *Julien l'Apostat*, I (3 ed. 1906), pp. 35-40; Jacob Burckhardt, *Die Zeit Konstantins des Grossen* (4 ed. 1924), pp. 158-60.

[25] Boll, *PW* 6, 2377-78.

Firmicus insists again and again that the annihilation of paganism is a sacred duty committed by God directly to the Emperors for the happiness and prosperity of the peoples of the Empire. With confused and turgid rhetoric he appeals to the most sacred Emperors " and the power of their faith so deserving of reverence, which is set up over human beings and is without part in earthly frailty, which joins itself in alliance with things of heaven, which follows the will of God on high in so far as it can in all its acts." God has intended these more than human Emperors to be the gonfaloniers of the faith (*erigite vexillum fidei, vobis hoc divinitas reservavit*). By the especial favor of God on high (*favore eminentis dei*) the Emperors have triumphed over all their enemies, whose activity has been disgracing the Roman Empire. In a white heat of passion he urges the Emperors to raise on high the standard of a law to be revered (*signum venerandae legis*), and utters the scarcely Christian sentiment, " May there be thus prosperity and happiness to the State, because amid heaps of slaughtered victims you have overthrown the enemies' forces! " God has made the Emperors the sharers of His glory and His will. Christ in his graciousness reserved for the Emperors the duty of blotting out idolatry and of destroying pagan shrines. He closes his apostrophe to the Emperors by encouraging them to exult boldly, to rejoice in the desolation of things profane, for their imperial good fortune is linked with God's own might. Theirs is to be a victory for the salvation of mankind with Christ fighting at their side (*Christo pugnante*).[28]

---

[26] *De errore*, 16, 4 (Ziegler, p. 39).

[27] *Ibid.*, 16, 5 (Ziegler, pp. 39-40).

Firmicus continues with relentless fervor his importunities to the Emperors to destroy without a qualm the ornaments of the temples. They are urged to put the pagan gods in the furnace and make coinage out of them, and to confiscate all temple treasure.[29] He declares that the winter season was delayed and the order of time itself disregarded in order that the Emperor might pass over the swelling and raging waves of the ocean, a thing which had never happened before and would never happen again. Under the oars of the Emperors' ship a sea almost unknown to the Roman world trembled in a sort of awe (*maris unda contremuit*), and the Briton quailed before the unexpected appearance of the Emperor. (The expedition of Constans to Britain in 343 is mentioned more soberly in Ammianus.)[30] What more could even an Emperor wish for? What had never happened before and would never happen again, had fallen to the lot of the Emperors: the elements had yielded to their strength.[31] The Emperors had learned what they should follow and what they should avoid from God's own immortal voice.[32] The necessity of God's own law impelled the Emperors to track down idolatry with all severity.[33] To the most sacred Emperors God had ever rendered aid that turned adversity into victory because of their faith; now He was inviting them to share in the secrets of that law ever to be revered (*ad arcana venerandae legis*), and so by divine majesty do the Emperors rule the earth with *felix imperium*.[34]

---

[28] *De errore*, 20, 7 (Ziegler, pp. 53-54).

[29] *De errore*, 28, 6 (Ziegler, p. 76).

[30] Ammianus Marcellinus, XX, 1, 1 (Clark, I, 184).

[31] *De errore*, 28, 6 (Ziegler, p. 76).

[32] *De errore*, 28, 9 (Ziegler, p. 78).

[33] *De errore*, 29, 1 (Ziegler, p. 81), where Firmicus quotes Deut. 13:6-11.

[34] *De errore*, 29, 4 (Ziegler, p. 82).

Although in the *De errore* Firmicus gives a euhemeristic explanation to the origin of the Graeco-Roman pantheon,[35] he does not discuss Emperor-worship, which scarcely falls within the scope of the *Mathesis,* but which he might very well have considered in the tract on religions. His avoidance of the subject, in fact, deserves notice. In the *Mathesis* Firmicus appears to be obsessed with the divinity of the Emperor and in the *De errore* with his sanctity. If he was converted to Christianity during the time which elapsed between the composition of the two works, as is often alleged, we have here perhaps unique evidence of the change effected by the adoption of Christianity in the individual's attitude towards the Emperor during the fourth century.

The terms used to address the Emperor in the *De errore* are very illuminating. Constantius and Constans are twice called " sacrosanct Emperors " (*sacrosancti principes*),[36] and thirteen times are called " most sacred Emperors " (*sacratissimi imperatores*),[37] while the same epithet is employed to characterize the imperial senses and minds.[38] Although all this stands in strong contrast to the emphasis upon the divinity of the Emperor in the *Mathesis,* it must not be assumed that emphasis upon the sanctity of the Emperor involves a peculiarly Christian point of view. It is true that to the Christian the Emperor was doubly sacred because he was the chosen and anointed of God, but behind the Christian use of the word *sanctus* in its application to the Emperor there lies a pagan background.[39] Ever since the time of Augustus the *tribunicia potestas* had resided in the Emperor, and the persons of tribunes had been inviolable *(sanc-*

---

[35] *De errore,* 7, 6 (Ziegler, p. 22).

[36] *De errore,* 13, 1 (Ziegler, p. 31), 17, 1 (p. 40).

[37] *De errore,* 3, 2 (Ziegler, p. 8), 6, 1 (p. 15), 7, 7 (p. 22), 8, 4 (pp. 24-25), 16, 3-4 (pp. 38-39), 20, 7 (p. 53), 24, 9 (p. 64), 25, 4 (p. 67), 28, 6 (p. 76), 29, 1, 3-4 (pp. 81-82).

[38] *De errore,* 25, 1 (Ziegler, p. 65), 29 1 (p. 81).

[39] Hippolyte Delehaye, " Sanctus," *Analecta Bollandiana,* XXVIII (1909), pp. 151-152.

tique sunto).[40] The Emperors inherited the tribunician sacrosanctity, which became the more impressive under Christianity, however, when the Emperor as elect of God ruled by divine right.[41]

Firmicus's pamphlet on the *Error of Profane Religions* is not unlike Athanasius's earliest extant work, the treatise *Contra gentes,* which was written about 318 or 320 A. D. when the author was in his early twenties. The *Contra gentes* is also a polemic against paganism. It is another instance of a Christian apologist elaborating the obvious and contributing to a literary *genre* in which many writers both pagan and Christian had already anticipated him. After discussing the development and general history of idolatrous worship—the soul separating from God becomes materialized, and cherishing earthly things it comes even to deify them, thus plunging itself into delusion and superstition [42]—Athanasius ridicules the apotheosis of Antinous, the lover of the Emperor Hadrian, at whose command this new God was added to the already bewildering pantheon. Men had thus come to worship through fear "a mere man and not a respectable man." [43] To Athanasius the Emperor-cult was much the same thing. It was not very long ago, he says, even if it is no longer the case, that the Roman Senate used to bestow divinity upon such Emperors as it wished and would then decree that they be worshipped as gods. But Emperors who had been unpopular with the Senate were treated as enemies and were acknowledged to have been mere men. The Senate, however, revealed in this way the true nature of all Emperors. Popular Emperors had been deified on account of their greatness as men (δι' ἀνδραγαϑίαν), just as though it lay within the power of members of the Senate to create gods, although they were themselves but men and made no claim to immortality for themselves. But if they could make gods, they would *eo ipso* have had to be gods, " for that which makes must needs be greater than that which it makes." If Senators could decree divinity to whomever they pleased, they must have been gods themselves. Athanasius finally finds the reduction to absurdity in the death of these Senators, and so the whole travesty of the imperial apotheosis so generously voted to a long series of men is made manifest.[44]

---

[40] Cicero *De legibus* iii. 9.

[41] W. Sickel, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen,* 1901, pp. 387 ff.

[42] Athanasius, *Contra gentes,* 8 (*PG* 25, 16D-17D).

[43] *Ibid.,* 9 (*PG* 25, 20C).

But Athanasius has not pursued an original theme in his attack upon idolatry and worship of the Emperor. We have already noted much the same treatment of the same subject in the apologies which Marcianus Aristides and Justin Martyr addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius about the middle of the second century A. D. When all allowance is made, however, for the peculiar conservatism which attaches itself to religious discussions and leads ecclesiastical writers of all ages to open and shut the same doors which their predecessors have opened and shut for generations or centuries before them, it would be unwise to suppose that Athanasius's attack upon idolatry and Emperor-worship was written without the expectation of interested readers to whom its contents might offer some guidance. Unlike the *Error of Profane Religions,* to which it bears a close resemblance except for the fact that the latter work contains no discussion of Emperor-worship, Athanasius's polemic *Against Pagans* is not addressed to the Emperor.

In passing from Firmicus and Athanasius to Cyril of Jerusalem we pass from a layman and a theological student respectively to a contemporary Bishop. Cyril's tone of address to the Emperor differs from that of Firmicus, as we might expect, but he seems to be no less deferential. In the first year of Cyril's episcopacy, on May 7, 351 A. D., a parhelion or some other celestial phenomenon appeared about nine o'clock in the morning over the city of Jerusalem. It took the form of a cross and gleamed for several hours over the hill of Golgotha, extending to the Mount of Olives.[45] Cyril wrote to Constantius to describe the wondrous sight to him and to inform the Emperor of his recent accession to the see of Jerusalem.

---

[44] *Ibid.*, 9 (*PG* 25, 20D-21A). *Cf. ibid.*, 21 (41D-44A).

[45] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Epistula ad Constantium Imperatorem,* 4 (*PG* 33,

The letter is addressed “ to the Emperor Constantius Augustus, most beloved of God and most pious ” (*βασιλεῖ ϑεοφιλεστάτῳ καὶ εὐσεβεστάτῳ Κωνσταντίῳ Αὐγούστῳ*).[46] Upon becoming Bishop, Cyril sends this letter as the first fruits of his office, so to speak, “ to his Majesty beloved of God ” (*πρὸς τὴν ϑεοφιλῆ σου βασιλείαν*). He writes that this is not a letter of flattery, but its purpose is to tell the Emperor of the divine vision which has revealed truths of heaven.[47] Others may crown with gold and bright gems the Emperor’s “precious head” (*ἡ τιμία σου κεφαλή*), but such gifts are of this earth and they will not abide. Cyril for his part offers the Emperor as annates this crowning vision from heaven, which has made its appearance as the blessed cross over Jerusalem “ in the time of his Majesty beloved of God ” (*ἐν τοῖς τῆς ϑεοφιλοῦς σου βασιλείας καιροῖς*). Cyril’s announcement of this vision is not made to his Imperial Piety (*ἡ σὴ εὐσέβεια*) to bring the latter from ignorance to a knowledge of God; for the Emperor has been the first to teach others from the resources of his own piety (*φϑάνεις γὰρ καὶ ἑτέρους διδάσκων, δι’ ὧν εὐσεβεῖς*); but rather so that the Emperor may be still further strengthened by hearing of this greater crown from heaven, that he may give fitting thanks “to God the Supreme Emperor” (Θεῷ . . . *τῷ* Παμβασιλεῖ) and understand “ that his Majesty is beloved by God ” (*τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν ἀγαπᾶσϑαι πρὸς* Θεοῦ).[48] The crown of which he speaks and which moves him to such eloquence is, of course, the blessed cross which appeared in the heavens.[49]

1169A). *Cf.* G. Delacroix, *Saint Cyrille de Jerusalem* (Paris, 1865), pp. 153-157.

[46] *Ep. ad Constant. Imp.* (*PG* 33, 1165A); *cf.* 6 (1172B); 7 (1174A); 8 (1176A).

[47] *Ibid.*, 1 (*PG* 33, 1165A); *cf.* 5 (1172A).

[48] *Ep. ad Constant. Imp.*, 2 (*PG* 33, 1165B-1168A).

[49] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 33, 1170A).

In the time of Constantius's father, "Constantine, most beloved of God and of blessed memory" (*θεοφιλέστατος καὶ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης*), the true cross and the holy places were discovered. "But in your reign, my Lord, Emperor most pious of all, surpassing with a greater piety towards God even the piety of your fathers, miracles no longer come from the earth, but from heaven!"[50]

To call Cyril's attitude towards the Emperor merely respectful would be something of an understatement. Cyril shows in fact much the same attitude towards Constantius as Eusebius half a generation before showed towards Constantine the Great.[51] Cyril takes pains to emphasize what he apparently considers the semi-divine nature of the imperial office. The letter abounds in suggestive associations of the Emperor with God, and Cyril began by insisting that no flattery would be intended. Cyril refers to the Emperor's power as dear to God (*τὸ θεοφιλές σου κράτος*). The Emperor's piety is inspired by God (*ἡ ἔνθεος εὐσέβεια*). He is a figure of unfailing courage, and God is his ally (*πάσης ἀνδρείας συνήθους πεπληρωμένος . . . αὐτὸν ἔχων Θεὸν σύμμαχον*).[52] He is equipped with every virtue (*πάσῃ κεκοσμημένος ἀρετῇ*). He is resplendent with the great rewards of piety (*μείζοσιν εὐσεβείας βραβείοις λαμπρυνόμενος*).[53] Cyril closes his epistle with a prayer that God grant to the Emperor Augustus, most beloved of God, many years to reign as protector of the holy churches and of the Roman Empire.[54]

---

[50] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 33, 1168B): "'Επὶ δὲ σοῦ, δέσποτα, πανευσεβέστατε βασιλεῦ, προγονικὴν εὐσέβειαν μείζονι τῇ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐλαβείᾳ νικῶντος, οὐκ ἀπὸ γῆς λοιπόν, ἀλλ' ἐξ οὐρανῶν τὰ θαυματουργήματα!"

[51] If the sometimes alleged Arianism of Cyril was well substantiated (the charge is made by Jerome, Socrates, and Sozomen), which is not the case, we might have reserved Cyril's letter for the following chapter as an example of Arian deference to the Emperor. If we knew more of Cyril's career, it might be that we should be justified in so using it. His biographer, G. Delacroix (1865), pp. 22-58, defends him, however, against the charge of Arianism, of which there appears to be no trace in his extant works. See also E. Venables, *D. C. B.*, I (1877), pp. 760-763.

[52] *Ep. ad Constant. Imp.*, 5 (*PG* 33, 1172A).

[53] *Ibid.*, 8 (*PG* 33, 1174B).

[54] *Ibid.*, 8 (*PG* 33, 1174B-1176A).

Deference and respect, but with certain *arrières-pensées,* were accorded the Emperor in the generation after Constantine by Bishops whose relations with Constantius were becoming strained by Arian activity at the court in Constantinople. Constans and Constantius had summoned a Council to meet at Sardica (Sophia) in the latter half of 343 A. D. Athanasius had been in exile some four years. The history and results of this Council need not detain us, but the synodal letter addressed by the western Bishops at Sardica to the Emperor Constantius is typical of the orthodox attitude towards the Emperor during the fifth decade of the fourth century. It would seem that a similar letter, no longer extant, was sent to Constans, the protector of Athanasius and of orthodoxy.

The western Bishops inform Constantius of their disapproval of Arian persecution of Christians. They make a plea for toleration and for the true faith. The Bishops assure the Emperor, however, that all is calm at Sardica, nowhere is there evidence of sedition. The benignant nature of the most happy Lord Augustus is in harmony with his benign good will, they write, and his abundant mercy flows from a fountain of paternal piety *(Benignifica natura tua, domine beatissime Auguste, cum benigna voluntate concordat et . . . de fonte paternae pietatis tuae misericordia largiter profluit. . .).*[55] The terms of reference and titles of address show the profound reverence which the Bishops apparently wished the Emperor to believe they felt for him (*clementia tua, singularis et ammirabilis sapientia tua, tua mansuetudo, sanctitas tua, gloriosissime Auguste, ingenita tua bonitas, lenitas tua, obsecramus pietatem tuam*).[56] Although the Bishops, even at this early date, did not approve of Constantius as a man with Arian sympathies, his position as Emperor still clearly entitled him in their eyes to unqualified respect.

Throughout his earlier career Athanasius like Eusebius and Cyril has a very high regard for the Emperor and his office.

---

[55] *Oratio synodi Sardicensis ad Constantium Imperatorem* (formerly attributed to Hilary of Poitiers as the first part of the misnamed *Liber primus ad Constantium*), 1 (Feder, *CSEL* 65, p. 181).

[56] *Ibid.*, 1-2, 4 (*CSEL* 65, pp. 181-183).

In the encyclical letter to his fellow Bishops, written about April of 340 A. D., Athanasius refers to Constantius as "the most pious Emperor" (ὁ εὐσεβέστατος βασιλεύς),[57] and this in the midst of the bitter controversy at the beginning of his second exile. As with all the Fathers of the fourth century Athanasius uses frequent comparisons between God and the Emperor as a rhetorical device for showing the greater glory of God. The Emperor on earth, and God in heaven, is each a *kosmokrator*.[58]

Thus, to illustrate the relation of the Logos to the universe, Athanasius compares therewith the founding of a great city by the Emperor. With the single impulse of a nod of the Word of God, so to speak, all things have fallen into order at the same time; each element discharges its proper function, and a single order is composed of all things taken together. Even so is it when a great city is being built and administered in the presence of the Emperor; he gives orders and supervises all things; all men obey him, some doing one thing and some another.[59] The work of redemption is also illustrated by an imperial simile. When the Logos perceived that death was the only means of rescuing men from their corruption, He assumed a body capable of death, in order that He might die in the stead of all, and that thereafter corruption might be stayed from all, and salvation gained from the grace of His resurrection. The incorruptible Son of God, being thus conjoined with all men by the like nature he had assumed, naturally clothed all with incorruption by the promise of the resurrection. For the actual corruption in death has no longer ground to hold against men by reason of the Logos, who by His body has come to dwell among men. This is all, to say the least, abstruse. Athanasius seeks to make the redemption clearer by a comparison with the Emperor. When the latter has taken up his abode in some house in a great city, the city is held worthy of high honor, and no enemy or bandit any longer dares to descend upon it or to subject it. The city is thought to be entitled to every consideration merely because the Emperor took up residence in a single dwelling there. It is the same with the Emperor of the universe (*οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πάντων βασιλέως γέγονεν*), for since he has come to the city of the earth, and taken up his abode in the body of man, henceforth the whole plot of the enemy against mankind is checked, and the corruption of death which had formerly prevailed is abolished.[60] These two comparisons of God and Emperor, which cast an interesting light upon the place of the Emperor in Athanasius's thought, must suffice for several such to be found in his early work.[61]

---

[57] Athanasius, *Epistula encyclica ad episcopos*, 5 (*PG* 25, 233B).

[58] K. F. Hagel, *Kirche und Kaisertum in Lehre und Leben des Athanasius* (Tübingen diss., Leipzig, 1933), pp. 11-12.

[59] *Contra gentes*, 43 (*PG* 25, 85CD-88A). *Cf. ibid.*, 38 (76AB).

In the discourses which Athanasius composed during his third exile, and so after 356, against the Arians (*Orationes contra Arianos*), he twice uses imperial similes of like nature,[62] which indicate that the unhappy experiences he has suffered at the Emperor's hands have not yet altered his general attitude towards the imperial office, or else he is unconsciously distinguishing between the office and the man who held it.

It is no part of our present purpose to tell the dramatic story of Athanasius against the world; it is rather to determine the place the Emperor occupied in the thought of Athanasius. About the middle of 357 the latter composed his *Apologia ad Constantium Imperatorem,* which was quite obviously intended for the Emperor's consideration, for at one point, for example, he assumes the Emperor must be smiling at what he has written (*μειδιᾷς γάρ, καὶ τοῦτο μειδιῶν σημαίνεις*).[63] The *Apology to Constan-*

---

[60] Athanasius, *De incarnatione verbi,* 9 (*PG* 25, 112ABC). Compare *ibid.,* 10 (112C) and 13 (120A). Note also the similar comparison in *Oratio altera contra Arianos,* 79 (*PG* 26, 316A), where the Emperor has dispatched his son to build the city, which is then compared with the work of God the Creator and Framer of all things.

[61] *Contra gentes,* 21 (*PG* 25, 41D-44A); *ibid.,* 38 (76AB). *De incarnatione verbi,* 10 (*PG* 25, 112C); *ibid.,* 13 (120A); *ibid.,* 27 (144B); *ibid.,* 55 (193BC).

[62] *Oratio altera contra Arianos,* 79 (*PG* 26, 316A) and *Oratio tertia contra Arianos,* 5 (332AB).

[63] Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium Imperatorem,* 16 (*PG* 25, 613C).

tius is the most finished production that we have from the pen of Athanasius. That is as it should be. In 310 the panegyrist who addressed Constantine at Trèves had observed that orations intended for the Sacred Presence should be given the most careful preparation, " and nothing should reach the ears of so great a divinity that has not been long in the writing and often re-considered " (*neque ad aures tanti numinis quicquam nisi diu scriptum et saepe tractatum adferri oportere*).[64] Whoever presented the Emperor with an extemporaneous production did not appreciate the greatness of the *imperium*.[65] Athanasius had no illusions as to imperial divinity—no more, in fact, than the panegyrist—but it is interesting to note that the *Apology to Constantius* is by far his best written work. It gives full expression to his ideal of the relationship of Christian Church and imperial State, inspired by the apparent benevolence of Constantine towards the Church, the ideal of " a free Church under the protection of the Emperor." [66] This work corresponds in its expressed attitude towards the Emperor to the *Ad Constantium* of Hilary of Poitiers, which seems to have been delivered in the Emperor's presence, and which we shall consider in some detail in its proper place. Athanasius's *Apologia ad Constantium* is throughout extremely respectful in tone. He begins his defense before " Augustus most beloved of God " (*ϑεοφιλέστατος Αὔγουστος*) with the acknowledgment that the latter is " a lover of God by descent " (*ἐκ προγόνων φιλόϑεος*).[67] His brother Constans is " the most pious Augustus of blessed and everlasting memory " (*ὁ εὐσεβέστατος Αὔγουστος . . . μακαρίας μνήμης καὶ αἰωνίου*)[68] and " that lover of Christ " (*ὁ φιλόχριστος* ἐκεῖνος).[69] Athanasius addresses the Emperor with terms of great reverence; and when all allowance is made for the grandiloquence of conventional titles of address, they are perhaps excessive. He calls the Emperor: "Sire" (βασιλεύς),[70] "your Humanity" (ἡ σὴ φιλανθρωπία),[71] "most humane Augustus" (φιλανθρωπότατος Αὔγουστος),[72] "your Worship" (ἡ σὴ θεοσέβεια),[73] "most worshipful Augustus" (θεοσεβέστατος Αὔγουστος),[74] "your Excellency" (ἡ σὴ καλοκἀγαθία),[75] "your Clemency" (ἡ σὴ ἡμερότης),[76] "Emperor most zealous in inquiries (after truth)" (φιλομαθέστατος βασιλεύς),[77] "your Piety" (ἡ σὴ εὐσέβεια),[78] "your Grace" (ἡ σὴ εὐλάβεια) and "lover of truth" (φιλαλήθης).[79] These terms stand in sad contrast to what he has to say about the Emperor a little over a year later.

---

[64] *Pan.* VI (VII), 1, 1 (W. Baehrens, p. 200).

[65] *Pan.* VI (VII), 1, 2 (W. Baehrens, p. 201): " Nam qui apud imperatorem populi Romani dicit ex tempore, quantum sit non sentit imperium." *Cf. Pan.* VIII (V), 1 (W. Baehrens, pp. 232-33).

[66] K. F. Hagel, *Kirche und Kaisertum in Lehre und Leben des Athanasius* (Tübingen diss., Leipzig, 1933), p. 44.

[67] Athanasius, *Apol. ad Constant.*, 1 (*PG* 25, 596A). *Cf. ibid.*, 6 (604A), 15 (613B), 16 (613C), 18 (617B), 24 (624D), 32 (640A), *et passim*.

[68] *Ibid.*, 2 (*PG* 25, 597A), 3 (597C), 5 (601C), *et passim*. *Cf.* the reference to Constantine the Great in *cap.* 33 (640B).

Athanasius denies that he had ever slandered Constantius to his brother Constans, for how could he be possessed of such madness as to abuse an Emperor before an Emperor? [80] Constantius is urged to get to the bottom of this charge against Athanasius: "Search into the matter, as though Truth shared the throne with you, for she is the defense of Emperors and especially of Christian Emperors, and she will make your reign secure." [81] The abstract reference to Truth has an almost Synesian ring.

The attitude of Athanasius towards the Emperor Constans, as a matter of fact, is consistently favorable. Although in the

---

[69] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 25, 600A).

[70] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 25, 600A), 9 (605B), 15 (612D), 17 (616B), *et passim.*

[71] *Ibid.*, 2 (*PG* 25, 597A), 3 (597D), 22 (624A), *et passim.*

[72] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 25, 600A).

[73] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 25, 597D), 4 (600D), 32 (637B), *et passim.*

[74] *Ibid.*, 14 (*PG* 25, 612B).

[75] *Ibid.*, 32 (*PG* 25, 637C).

[76] *Ibid.*, 21 (*PG* 25, 621B).

[77] *Ibid.*, 18 (*PG* 25, 620A).

[78] *Ibid.*, 27 (*PG* 25, 629A), 29 (632B), 32 (637B), *et passim.*

[79] *Ibid.*, 1 (*PG* 25, 596A, 597A), *et passim.*

[80] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PG* 25, 601C).

[81] *Ibid.*, 11 (*PG* 25, 609A).

Apology to Constantius he tells the latter that he was never intimate enough with his brother Constans to talk with him alone,[82] his references to Constans are always respectful even in the (later and anti-Constantian) *History of the Arians,* where Constans is called "most pious" (εὐσεβέστατος)[83] and "most worshipful" (θεοσεβέστατος).[84] Constantius has spoken of the affection he felt towards his late brother "of divine and pious memory" (ὁ τῆς θείας καὶ εὐσεβοῦς μνήμης),[85] and Athanasius hastily concurs in this description of "the blessed Constans" (ὁ μακαρίτης Κώνστας).[86] It is germane to note here that Hosius of Cordova, in after years like Athanasius the opponent of Constantius, shows similar deference to the memory of Constans.[87]

To those prayers which all men offer for the Emperor's safety Athanasius adds in the *Apology to Constantius* his own pious hope that the Emperor may "live through the course of many years to come."[88] Athanasius claims that he has never resisted the commands of his Imperial Piety (ἡ σὴ εὐσέβεια), nor would he now attempt a return to Alexandria unless his Imperial Humanity (ἡ σὴ φιλανθρωπία) should desire it.[89] But what Athanasius finds especially confusing, he says, is that whereas he addresses the Emperor "with reverence" (μετ' εὐλαβείας), his calumniators have had the "effrontery" (ἀναισχυντία) to lie to the Emperor.[90] Constantius's fineness of character does not go unappreciated by Athanasius, who takes pains to emphasize the Emperor's "Christian zeal and piety" (ἡ σὴ φιλόχριστος σπουδὴ καὶ ϑεοσέβεια),[91] as well as his "forbearance and humanity" (ἡ ἀνεξικακία καὶ ἡ φιλανϑρωπία).[92]

---

[82] *Apol. ad Constant.*, 3 (*PG* 25, 597C-600C).

[83] *Hist. Arian.*, 20 (*PG* 25, 716D).

[84] *Ibid.*, 29 (*PG* 25, 725C).

[85] *Ibid.*, 49-50 (*PG* 25, 753AB).

[86] *Ibid.*, 49-50 (*PG* 25, 753).

[87] Hosius of Cordova, *Ep. ad Constant. Imp.*, in Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.*, 44 (*PG* 25, 745C).

[88] *Apol. ad Constant.*, 18 (*PG* 25, 617B).

[89] *Ibid.*, 26 (*PG* 25, 628D).

[90] *Ibid.*, 13 (*PG* 25, 612A).

If we do not regard the *Apology to Constantius* as obsequious, it is certainly not unflattering. Since it was addressed directly to the Emperor, it may be thought to contain what Athanasius wished the Emperor to believe was his attitude towards him. A little over a year later, in 358 A. D., he composed a secret attack upon Constantius, as we shall see, but there is no evidence to show that he wished to acquaint Constantius with the startling change we shall find in his attitude towards him. A short time before, in defending himself against a charge of cowardice in fleeing from Alexandria (in the *Apologia de fuga*), he had loftily refrained from noticing Constantius except to refer to him coldly as "the heretic" (ὁ αἱρετικός).[93] The break had come, and he was never reconciled to the Emperor.

[91] *Ibid.*, 28 (*PG* 25, 629D).

[92] *Ibid.*, 32 (*PG* 25, 637B).

[93] *Apol. de fuga*, 26 (*PG* 25, 677B).

CHAPTER IV

ARIAN DEFERENCE AND ATHANASIAN OPPOSITION

It had become clear by the middle of 358 A. D. that Constantius was irrevocably committed to Arianism. Athanasius's disillusionment was apparently so great, his ideal of an independent Church protected by an orthodox Emperor so completely shattered, that he could not refrain from launching an attack upon Constantius. He wrote what is ostensibly a *History of the Arians (Historia Arianorum),* but is in effect a derogatory pamphlet directed against Constantius, in which without reference to the highly laudatory estimate of the Emperor implied throughout the *Apology to Constantius,* the latter is made the object of all the bitter abuse to which Athanasius could lay his tongue. But Athanasius was not anxious to identify himself with this work; it was published anonymously, a sort of *historia arcana.*[1]

The Emperor Constantius, who in the *Apology* addressed to him was commended for his " Christian zeal and piety " (ἡ σὴ φιλόχριστος σπουδὴ καὶ ϑεοσέβεια),[2] is condemned in the privately circulated *History of the Arians* because of his " zeal for impiety " (ἡ πρὸς τὴν ἀσέβειαν σπουδή).[3] He who was distinguished in the *Apology* for his graciousness, his complete familiarity with Scripture,[4] his " forbearance and humanity " (ἡ ἀνεξικακία καὶ ἡ φιλανϑρωπία)[5] has become in the *History* a " patron of impiety and Emperor of heresy " (ὁ τῆς ἀσεβείας προστάτης καὶ τῆς αἱρέσεως βασιλεύς).[6] But more than this, he is

---

[1] *Cf.* Eugene Fialon, *Saint Athanase* (Paris, 1877), pp. 196 ff.

[2] Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium,* 28 (*PG* 25, 629D).

[3] *Historia Arianorum,* 30 (*PG* 25, 728B).

[4] *Apol. ad Constant.,* 18 (*PG* 25, 617BC).

[5] *Ibid.,* 32 (*PG* 25, 637B).

[6] *Hist. Arian.,* 45 (*PG* 25, 748D).

"godless, unholy, without natural affection . . . this modern Ahab, this second Belshazzar" (ὁ ἄϑεος . . . ὁ ἀνόσιος . . . ὁ ἄστοργος . . . ὁ νέος Ἀχαὰβ καὶ ἄλλος Βαλϑασάρ).[7] Constantius is attacked as the "enemy of Christ, leader of impiety, and as it were antichrist himself" (ὡς χριστομάχος ἡγεμὼν τῆς ἀσεβείας . . . Κωνστάντιος, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ ἀντίχριστος).[8] The name Constantius is reduced to the contemptuous diminutive "Costyllius" (Κοστύλλιος).[9] The Emperor whose Christian piety inspired the *Apologia ad Constantium* is now declared to be no Christian; he may be antichrist himself, and if he is not, he is at any rate the very image of antichrist.[10] Athanasius charges that pagans and Arians were more completely dominated by the Emperor than orthodox Christians, for pagans and Arians were ignorant of true godliness.[11] As for Constantius, he is flatly called a liar: he had promised to support Athanasius and had thereupon foully betrayed him.[12]

The reader familiar with the historical background of the *Apologia ad Constantium* and the *Historia Arianorum* is well aware of extenuating circumstances that do much to explain these startling inconsistencies in Athanasius's attitude towards the Emperor which these two works display. Athanasius's hopes for the Church under imperial guidance, inspired by a hasty appraisal under Constantine of the benefits to be derived from such guidance, were being blasted by a heretic Emperor. The Nicene Bishops who had eagerly accepted the Emperor's support of orthodoxy in 325 A. D., and Athanasius was prominent among them, had in that bright honeymoon of their hopes regarded the Emperor as the true husband of the Church. The husband now was Constantius, however, and he was proving unfaithful. In the novelty of their first close association with the all-powerful Emperor, Christian Bishops had failed adequately to consider, and especially so when they assembled under the virtual presidency of Constantine at Nicaea, and when they obeyed imperial summonses to Tyre, Jerusalem, Antioch, Sardica, Philippopolis, and Milan, that the Emperor might seek to rule the Church of *his* Empire, that he might regard the Church as not merely in, but actually of that Empire. In the respectful *Apologia ad Constantium* we see Athanasius's lingering hopes that he might not do so, in the reserved *Apologia de fuga* the growing fear that he was doing so, and in the violent *Historia Arianorum* the bitter realization that he had!

---

[7] *Ibid.*, 45 (*PG* 25, 749A). *Cf.* chapters 53 (757C) and 66 (772B).

[8] *Ibid.*, 67 (*PG* 25, 773B). *Cf.* chapter 80 (792A).

[9] *Ibid.*, 74 (*PG* 25, 781C); 80 (792A).

[10] *Ibid.*, 74 (*PG* 25, 781CD-784A); 77 (785CD-788A).

[11] *Ibid.*, 78 (*PG* 25, 788BCD); 56-57 (760D-761B).

[12] *Ibid.*, 22 (*PG* 25, 717D-720A); 30 (725D-728B); *et passim.*

Eusebians and Athanasians alike had appealed to and relied upon imperial authority with no apparent hesitation as to its legality. Doubts arose only when the Emperor Constantius proved hostile to what Athanasius regarded as Christian orthodoxy. Then the pressure of imperial intervention which he had not scrupled to use at Nicaea to its fullest extent gradually became in his eyes profane aggression against the freedom of the God-granted Church. Athanasius seems to have been the first to perceive the new danger which confronted the Church, and the contrast between his earlier and later attitudes towards the Emperor clearly reveals the extent of this reaction against the recognition of ecclesiastical rights as being part of the imperial prerogative.

Athanasius asks with indignation, "When did a judgment of the Church receive its validity from the Emperor? When was his decree ever recognized by the Church?" There had been many Councils in the past, and they had passed many judgments, "but the Fathers never sought the consent of the Emperor thereto, nor did the Emperor busy himself with the affairs of the Church!"[13] The Church's independence of the Emperor must be maintained; the Emperor had himself become the chief peril to Christian orthodoxy. We cannot know with what searchings of heart Athanasius abandoned the *Lieblingstheorie* of his earlier career.

---

[13] *Hist. Arian.*, 52 (*PG* 25, 756C).

Until late in the fourth century we find no theories of the relationship of Church and imperial State that could stand pat as the cards were being dealt. It was still not easy to distinguish between the Emperor as a man and the Emperor as a sovereign if such a distinction is ever very practicable. The fourth century furnished by its events and precedents the material wherewith later centuries might make distinctions between *sacerdotium* and *imperium* which would be academically precise, if not politically effective. After the Church had imperilled its freedom by hopefully and even recklessly enrolling in its number and enlisting in its service the Emperor, a profound re-adjustment to the *imperium* became necessary, for experience of the first Emperor after Constantine indicated that from the standpoint of the majority a Christian Emperor need not always be benign, not always orthodox. Athanasius was the author of that reaction.

Athanasius's statement in the *Historia Arianorum* that the Emperor had no right to interfere in the affairs of the Church and the implication that the Fathers had never sought imperial sanction for their judgments were made, obviously enough, with a preposterous disregard of the facts of fourth century conciliar history. The very expression of such a stand marks a startling departure from the accepted view of the imperial power. The Roman Emperor had been regarded as the supreme autocrat of the world. He was the source of all law, the elect of God, wielder of charismatic authority. His power had not been appraised in terms of its limitations. There had been none. But now there gathered around Athanasius and the cause he had embraced other Bishops of like orthodoxy and of like courage, for they had discovered that if the Church was to survive as the instrument of human salvation, it must be shielded from the caprice and political philosophy of the imperial autocrat.

It is hard to believe that Constantius was an Arian, or an almost Arian, purely, or even largely, from his religious convictions. The *rapprochement* of Church and State was necessary to the peace of the Empire, but it was beset with grave difficulties. Constantius was an Arian, because he saw in Arianism the most effective means of accommodating the Church to the imperial State. He was probably less interested in theology (and he was interested in theology) than he was in government. The question thus immediately arises whether the Arians were more obsequious to imperial wishes than orthodox churchmen. Did their attitude towards the Emperor differ from the attitude of the orthodox? A conclusive answer, and one that would be fair to the Arians, is scarcely possible, for not enough Arian literature has survived upon which to base it.

Athanasius gives us a direct reply to the query, however, if we choose to accept it. The Arians, he asserts, " have no King but Caesar." [14] He says that " while pretending to write about the Lord *(kyrios)*, they name another Master *(despotes)* for themselves—Constantius! " Those who deny that the Son is everlasting, he charges, " have called him ' Eternal Emperor ' " (αἰώνιον δὲ αὐτὸν βασιλέα εἰρήκασιν).[15] There is some point to his sarcasm. What we know of the associations of the Arian Eusebius of Nicomedia with Constantine, of Ursacius, Valens, and others with Constantius, and of Auxentius of Milan with Valentinian might seem to support this contention. In strong contrast, however, stand Arius himself and the little known Egyptian Bishops, the Arians Secundus and Theonas, in the reign of Constantine. The only consistent opposition to imperial intervention in the affairs of the Church seems to lie with the later Donatists in the West *(Quid imperatori cum ecclesia?)* [16] and with the later Arians who were called Eunomians. Whatever their deficiencies of character, Aetius and Eunomius certainly did not show subservience to the Emperor.[17] Sweeping generalizations are thus to be avoided. True Arians, sincere in their religious beliefs, seem not to have been numerous, however, and by and large those affiliated with the Arian movement appear to have been peculiarly susceptible to the influence of the Emperor.[18] There may have been no little truth in Athanasius's statement, already noted, that pagans and Arians were more completely under the Emperor's thumb than orthodox Christians, because pagans and Arians were ignorant of true godliness.[19]

---

[14] *Hist. Arian.*, 32-33 (*PG* 25, 729B-732C).

[15] *Epistola de synodis Arimensi et Seleuciana*, 3 (*PG* 26, 685A).

[16] *D. C. B.*, I (1877), 639, 652. *Cf.* A. Robertson, *NPNF.*, IV (2 ser. 1892), p. xlii.

It has been the misfortune of the Arian leaders and their cause to stand condemned at the bar of history because their opponents have written almost all the surviving testimony. It is my belief, however, that we should think much the same of them even if their defense had come down to us, but it must be acknowledged there is little in the extant literature, not written on the Athanasian bias, to bolster up Athanasius's allegation that the Arians were completely the tools of the Emperor. Some documents, for example, given in an appendix to a letter written by Athanasius to the Emperor Jovian purport to contain four petitions made by certain Arian leaders in 363 A. D. to Jovian at Antioch in an effort to secure the continuance of Athanasius's exile. Jovian is addressed by the Arians as " your Might, your Majesty, and your Piety " (*δεόμεθά σου τοῦ κράτους καὶ τοῦ βασιλείου σου καὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας σου*).[20] The Emperor Julian, who had just been killed in the Parthian campaign, is referred to as " most beloved of God and most philosophical and most blessed " (*ὁ θεοφιλέστατος καὶ φιλοσοφώτατος καὶ μακαριώτατος*).[21] They are strange epithets for Christians, albeit Arians, to apply to "the Apostate", for Julian despised all Christians without troubling to discriminate among them. Such usage illustrates more clearly than most texts the largely conventional character of such imperial titles of address and reference. They do indicate, however, that the Arians on the present occasion at any rate wished to appear respectful to the memory of Julian in the presence of his successor. The title "Majesty" (*βασίλειον*), which the Arians address to Jovian, seems not to occur elsewhere, but in such evidence as this there is no basis for a conclusion. Jovian refers to himself in his letter to Athanasius with the feminine abstract of the same meaning (*ἡ ἡμετέρα βασιλεία*),[22] but if there is a difference in meaning, as well as the difference in gender, between the two words, it is entirely lost on me. The four Arian addresses to Jovian reveal chiefly the fact that Arians as well as orthodox Christians recognize the imperial right to make appointments to the episcopacy (*ἐπίσκοπον ἡμῖν δός*).[23]

---

[17] Fialon, *Saint Athanase* (Paris, 1877), pp. 115-116.

[18] J. A. Möhler, *Athanasius der Grosse* (Mainz, 1844), p. 405; H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism* (Cambridge, 1900), pp. 63-64; but contrast Gwatkin, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

[19] *Hist. Arian.*, 78 (*PG* 25, 788BCD); 56-57 (760-761B).

[20] *Petitiones ad Iovianum Imperatorem* (*PG* 26, 820B, 821C).

[21] *Ibid.* (*PG* 26, 820C).

Although we need not go into the history of the twin Councils of Ariminum (Rimini) and Seleucia, which Athanasius has recounted at length in the last important work of his third exile *(De synodis)*, we should consider for our present purpose two important documents addressed to the Emperor Constantius from Ariminum in 359 A. D. The first is the synodal letter written by the Arian Bishops at Ariminum *Domino merito gloriosissimo ac victoriosissimo Augusto Constantio,* in which they address or refer to the Emperor as *pietas tua, clementia tua, domine, tua virtus et gloria, pie imperator,* and *domine imperator.* The tone of the letter is sufficiently indicated by picking out the phrase in which the Arian Bishops call the Emperor's attention to themselves as *nos igitur reddentes obsequium clementiae tuae* and by quoting the last words in which the Bishops pray that "Divina pietas gloriosissimum te semper et ubique per omnia faciat vindicem, domine piissime imperator." [24]

---

[22] *Epistola Ioviani Imperatoris ad Athanasium* (*PG* 26, 813B).

[23] *Pet. ad Iovian.* (*PG* 26, 820B).

This letter is a good deal more obsequious than the other document with which we are at the moment concerned, namely the synodal letter addressed *Beatissimo et gloriosissimo Augusto Constantio* by the orthodox western Bishops at Ariminum when they condemned Arianism. The terms of address and reference to the Emperor in the orthodox communication are *pietas tua, tua clementia, sapientia tua, sancta pietas tua (. . . et tua religiosa saecula), tua sancta prudentia, tua sancta religiosaque prudentia.*[25] The Emperor is reminded by the orthodox Bishops that the safety of his Empire and his own salvation are in Christ *(salvator imperii tui et largitor salutis tuae)*.[26]

The quality of *sanctitas* is prominent in the orthodox letter to the Emperor, and in this respect, as well as in its general tone and purpose, it recalls the letter written from Sardica to Constantius in 343 A. D. by the western Bishops, who actually address Constantius as *sanctitas tua.*[27] The Arian letter to Constantius is considerably more deferential than either the orthodox letter of 343 A. D. or of 359 A. D. In this connection it but remains to call attention to the fact that Athanasius quotes the Arian leaders as calling the Emperor Constantius " our Master the most pious and gloriously triumphant Emperor Constantius, the Eternal and the August " (*ὁ δεσπότης ἡμῶν ὁ εὐσεβέστατος καὶ καλλίνικος βασιλεὺς Κωνστάντιος Αὔγουστος ὁ αἰώνιος, σεβαστός*).[28] We have already noted the scorn which Athanasius heaps upon the Arians for calling Constantius " Eternal " while they deny the same epithet to the Son of God. Of course we have only

---

[24] *Ep. syn. Ariminensis Arianorum ad Constant.*, 1-3 (*CSEL* 65, pp. 87-88).

[25] *Ep. syn. Ariminen. Occidentalium ad Constant.*, 1-3 (*CSEL* 65, pp. 78-85).

[26] *Ibid.*, 1 (*CSEL* 65, p. 79).

[27] *Oratio synodi Sardicensis ad Constantium Imperatorem*, 2 (*CSEL* 65, p. 182).

[28] Athanasaius, *De synodis*, 8 (*PG* 26, 692B).

Athanasius's word for all this, and when it comes to Arianism, perhaps the testimony of Athanasius should not be accepted without question, but it is of value and is not entirely out of accord with the tenor of the few extant Arian documents addressed directly to the Emperor.

While there is thus no considerable evidence that the Arians were *eo ipso* more subservient to the Emperor than orthodox churchmen, there cannot be much doubt but that they were more easily controlled by the Emperor. The intellectualized theology of Arianism, which required no great resources of faith, made easy the transition from paganism to Christianity in an age when Christianity was fast becoming a prerequisite to imperial preferment. Arianism was less able than orthodox Christianity to resist the (to Athanasius) sinister designs of imperial statecraft. It was thus attacked by Athanasius and his supporters not alone for its doctrinal heresy, I take it, but also because they came to see that the inward weakness of Arianism offered the Emperor a dangerous instrument for the subordination of Church to State.

The remarkable change to be observed in the patristic attitude towards the Emperor as the fourth century advances, and we pass from Eusebius of Caesarea to the later career of Athanasius, is well illustrated by an episode related by Athanasius in the *Historia Arianorum.* It will serve also to introduce the attitude of Athanasius's fellow workers in the cause of orthodoxy towards the Emperor.

Constantius had summoned Lucifer of Calaris, Eusebius of Vercelli, and other western Bishops. He invited them to subscribe against Athanasius and " to hold communion with heretics " (so Athanasius represents *ad invidiam* what he wishes the reader to suppose the Emperor should have said). They protested that there was no ecclesiastical canon to this effect. Constantius's answer, it seems to me, goes to the heart of the problem, " Whatever I wish, let that be considered a canon! " (ὅπερ ἐγὼ βούλομαι, τοῦτο κανὼν νομιζέσϑω).[29] *L'Eglise, c'est moi!*

---

[29] *Hist. Arian.*, 33 (*PG* 25, 732C).

Although this was indubitably the attitude of Constantine towards the Church, he was at some pains to disguise it, while contemporary churchmen had either not suspected or had not dared to give expression to their suspicions of it. To Eusebius of Caesarea, as we have seen, the Emperor's aim should be the imitation of God, bringing the Empire on earth into conformity, in so far as was possible, with the Empire in heaven. The Fathers found it an appealing thesis; it constantly re-appears in their works. It is developed at some length, for example, in Gregory of Nyssa's funeral orations on Pulcheria and Flaccilla, daughter and wife respectively of the Emperor Theodosius the Great.[30] But Constantius proved to have a different idea of his function, or else a different idea of heaven, while Athanasius and his followers came to understand that their conception of the kingdom of heaven was not likely to be paralleled on earth. On this occasion, therefore, Lucifer, Eusebius, and the others addressed Constantius, we are told, "with great boldness of speech." [31] They informed him that the imperial sovereignty was not his, but God's who had given it to him, and who might take it from him. They warned him against interfering with the Church and confusing temporal with spiritual authority. Constantius threatened them, and they withdrew into proud and righteous exile.[32] If the price of imperial recognition was to be imperial domination, they would have none of it. It had thus suddenly become necessary to distinguish sharply between *sacerdotium* and *imperium;* the Athanasians did so, but left it to St. Ambrose towards the end of the century to elaborate upon that distinction. Pre-Constantinian theories of Church and State, however, had to be modified to cope with the problem Tertullian had not envisaged in his glib statement to a pagan world, *noster est magis Caesar, ut a nostro Deo constitutus* (*Apol.*, 33), the problem of the

---

[30] Gregory of Nyssa, *Orationes consolatoria in funere Pulcheriae et funebris de Placilla imperatrice* (*PG* 46, 863-892).

[31] *Hist. Arian.*, 34 (*PG* 25, 732C).

[32] *Ibid.*, 34 (*PG* 25, 732D-733B).

Christian Emperor in the Christian State, who sought by virtue of what Gregory Nazianzen was to call the imperial priesthood to rule the Christian Church as the supreme priest.

Those who supported Athanasius in his attack upon Arianism shared his resistance to the Emperor. In 352 A. D. the deacon Liberius became Pope and was immediately confronted with the Athanasian problem. He refused to recognize the validity of the action taken at Tyre fifteen years before when Athanasius's first exile had been skilfully contrived by his enemies. But now that the Emperor Constans, the protector of Athanasius, was dead, the latter's opponents were striking at him once more, and with the open support of Constantius. At Arles in 353 A. D. the Emperor had proposed, and the Council submissively passed, the condemnation of the intractable Athanasius. The desire for a more august body than a provincial synod to indicate its assent to the imperial decision against Athanasius led Constantius in 355 A. D. to assemble the Council of Milan, where each Bishop in attendance was offered the alternatives of subscribing to Athanasius's condemnation or of going into exile.[33] Liberius's request two years before this, about the beginning of 354 A. D., to the "most religious Emperor" *(religiosissimus Imperator)* for a Council that should meet at Aquileia and restore peace to the Church had been refused by the Emperor.[34] Liberius had therefore repeated his request for a Council, and inasmuch as the Arians had found Constantius increasingly favorable to them ever since his victory over Magnentius in September of 351 A. D., they too had been petitioning for a Council. Thus it was in answer to both parties that Constantius convoked the Council of Milan. The Athanasian party was the one disappointed in the outcome.

Of considerable interest, as it reflects the attitude of Pope Liberius towards the Emperor before the Council of Milan, is a letter which was sent by the Pope to the Emperor early in 354 A. D. It is a letter of dignity and of strength, independent, but acknowledging the imperial right to summon Councils, and expressing the hope that his Imperial Clemency will oppose no obstacle to a Council which should restore peace to all the Catholic churches.[35] The letter is addressed *gloriosissimo Constantio Augusto,* and the terms of address and of reference are throughout extremely respectful in tone *(obsecro, tranquillissime imperator; benignae aures* [*tuae*]*; clementia tua; Christianus imperator; sanctae memoriae filius Constantini; pietas tua; animus tuus, qui lenitati semper vacat; religiosissime imperator; mansuetudo tua; mentis tuae erga deum devotio; prudentia tua; clementissime imperator; aequitas et clementia tua; tranquillitas tua; mansuetudo tua et animus tuus deo devotus; tranquillitas tua consentiens; sanctae memoriae pater tuus; clementissime ac religiosissime Auguste).*[36] It must be observed, however, that titles of cult import *(numen, aeternitas, maiestas, perennitas)* such as were addressed by persons at court to the Emperor throughout the fourth century are carefully avoided in this letter. Liberius makes the most, nevertheless, as can easily be seen, of such titles as were felt to be fitting for a Bishop to apply to the Emperor. The Emperor's answer to all this came in the following year. It was the banishment of Liberius.[37] Two years later he yielded to Constantius.[38]

---

[33] The Councils of Arles and Milan, as well as the depositions of Athanasius, Liberius, and Hosius, are discussed with ample reference to the sources in Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des concilcs*, I (1907), pt. 2, pp. 869-884.

[34] Hilary of Poitiers, *Fragm.* VI, 3 (*PL* 10, 688B): *Collectanea Antiariana Parisina*, B VII, 6 (*CSEL* 65, p. 167).

---

[35] This letter, inc. *Obsecro, tranquillissime imperator,* is printed in *PL* 10, 682-686, and in *CSEL* 65, pp. 89 ff.; it is given with the slightly different incipit *Opto, tranquillissime imperator* in *CSEL* 14, pp. 327 ff. The letter has been preserved in Hilary of Poitiers's historico-polemical work, *Adv. Valentem et Ursacium libri III,* probably in the second book (for which see Fr. Feder, *CSEL* 65, pp. 189-193, especially 192).

[36] Liberius, *Ep. ad Constant. Imp.,* 1, 3-6 (*CSEL* 65, pp. 89-93).

[37] Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.,* 39 (*PG* 25, 737D-740B), reports a bold speech of Liberius to Constantius, warning him not to intrude impiety into the Church and accepting banishment as the price of orthodoxy.

[38] *Ibid.,* 41 (*PG* 25, 741B). Hilary of Poitiers, *Fragm.* VI, 4-5, 8 (*PL* 10, 688-690): *Coll. Antiarian. Paris.,* B VII, 7-8, 10 (*CSEL* 65, pp. 167-169, 170-171).

Associated with Liberius in the effort to prevent the condemnation of Athanasius was Eusebius of Vercelli. At Milan he stalwartly resisted the Emperor's attempts to make him subscribe against Athanasius. His work has unfortunately not survived: only three short letters are extant that are undoubtedly his.[39] His attitude towards the Emperor, however, apparently did not differ from that of Liberius. We get a glimpse into his relations with Constantius, for one of his three brief letters (the briefest!) is addressed to the Emperor. It is thoroughly respectful in tone, but avoids improper titles like *numen* and *aeternitas*. Eusebius writes (early in 355 A. D.) that he is hastening to Milan, pursuant to the Emperor's command.[40] Eusebius has received Constantius's summons with great joy, because he realizes that the " most clement Emperor " *(clementissime imperator)* desires ecclesiastical peace to hold sway throughout the world. He promises the " Lord Emperor " *(domine imperator)* that when he shall have come into the imperial presence, he will do " whatever shall have seemed just and pleasing to God," and he prays that God guard the " most glorious Emperor " *(gloriosissime imperator)*.[41] Although very much briefer, Eusebius's letter closely resembles in its tone that of Liberius. Unlike Liberius, however, Eusebius did not yield to Constantius.

The aged Hosius of Cordova, who had presided over the Councils of Nicaea and Sardica, Constantine's friend and adviser, also found himself with Athanasius, Liberius, and Eusebius of Vercelli in the camp of those doing battle with the Emperor. Hosius had been the western champion of orthodoxy. At Nicaea it had been he who had led the struggle to force the word *homoousion* into the revision of the Caesarean creed, rather than Athanasius, and in those memorable days he experienced, it would seem, few scruples about the Emperor's right to interfere in the affairs of the Church. He had gone to Alexandria in the previous year (324 A. D.) as an imperial emissary in a vain effort to settle the dispute between Arius and Alexander.[42] This would appear in itself to constitute recognition of Constantine's claim, whatever it may have meant, to an imperial episcopacy "in affairs without the Church" (*τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ ϑεοῦ καϑεσταμένος ἐπίσκοπος*).[43] But thirty years were to change all that, and Hosius now viewed with the gravest misgivings Constantius's ambition to exercise control over the Church.

---

[39] Eusebius of Vercelli, *Epistolae* (*PL* 12, 947-54: *PL* 10, 713-714: *CSEL* 65, pp. 46-47).

[40] The *epistola convocatoria* of Constantius is printed in *PL* 13, 564-565.

[41] Eusebius of Vercelli, *Ep. ad Constant. Imp.* (*PL* 12, 947CD).

At first sight it looks as though Hosius objected less to the Emperor's interference in the renewal of the conflict with Arianism, for at Nicaea he had obviously been in favor of Constantine's intervention, than he objected to the fact that Constantius was in his belief applying pressure to the wrong side. It would, however, be truer to say that Hosius had changed his mind, even as Athanasius had, in the intervening thirty years with regard to the position of the Emperor in the polity of the Church. In reply to several letters from Constantius, which sometimes flattered, sometimes threatened the old Bishop, and finally demanded of him whether he was going to remain "the only person to oppose the heresy" (so Athanasius expresses what he would have the reader believe ought to have been the Emperor's statement), Hosius answered in a fine epistle which is all that remains of his writings that he disapproved strongly of these imperial pronouncements and these attempts to intimidate him. "I am old enough to be your grandfather[44] . . . I write this in concern for your salvation."[45]

---

[42] Socrates, *H. E.*, I, 7 (*PG* 67, 56A).

[43] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, IV, 24 (*PG* 20, 1172A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 126).

[44] Hosius of Cordova, *Ep. ad Constant. Imp.* in Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 44 (*PG* 25, 745A).

[45] *Ibid.*, 44 (*PG* 25, 748A).

Constantius is urged to cease what he is doing, and to remember he is but a mortal man. He is to fear the day of judgment, and keep himself pure for that day. He is not to intrude himself into ecclesiastical matters, nor to issue orders to Bishops about such matters. He should rather learn such things from Bishops. God has bestowed the imperial sovereignty upon Constantius, but the affairs of the Church have been entrusted to Bishops. Just as anyone who should attempt to steal the imperial power from Constantius would be going contrary to the ordinance of God, so likewise should the Emperor on his side take heed, lest by taking upon himself the affairs of the Church he become guilty of a grievous crime. It is written, " Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." It is neither permitted to Bishops, therefore, to rule on earth, nor to the Emperor to discharge the functions of a priest.[46] The Emperor Constans of blessed memory is held up to his brother as a model of imperial propriety. When was any such thing ever done by Constans? What Bishop suffered banishment under him? When did he ever interfere in an ecclesiastical trial? When did he ever dispatch a Palatine officer to force one Bishop to subscribe against another? [47] No, God forbid! Such things were not done under his government as are now being done.[48] This sole text from the pen of Hosius is a very important one; we can almost witness the gradual nature of the change that has been effected by Constantius's caesaropapism in Hosius's attitude towards the imperial authority.

Perhaps the most striking and certainly the least attractive figure who rallied to the cause of Athanasius in the sixth decade of the fourth century was Lucifer of Calaris (Cagliari) in Sardinia. He contributed something more than his share to the disorder at Milan, where he appears to have indulged in a private quarrel with Constantius. The latter sent him into

[46] *Ibid.*, 44 (*PG* 25, 745D-748A).

[47] *Ibid.*, 44 (*PG* 25, 745C).

[48] *Ibid.*, 44 (*PG* 25, 745C).

exile. Lucifer lived in turn at Germanicia in Syrian Commagene, Eleutheropolis in Palestine, and was at length banished to the Thebaid, where he was kept until Constantius died in 361 A. D. The greater part of his exile seems to have been spent at Eleutheropolis, where the Arian Bishop Eutychius persecuted him, and where he probably wrote one or more of the five productions we have from his pen.[49] Each one of these five works is a violent attack upon the Emperor Constantius and his Arianizing policy.[50]

Lucifer possessed considerable learning in Scripture. There are abundant quotations in his works from the Old Testament, many from the New Testament, and several from the apologists. We even find a Ciceronian reminiscence *(Quousque tandem abuteris dei patientia, Constanti?)*.[51] In all the patristic literature of the fourth century that has come down to us I doubt very much whether anything so dull as these five scurrilous pamphlets of Lucifer against the Emperor Constantius can be found. When the first surprise and amusement at his manner of addressing the Emperor have passed, they are dreary reading. But Lucifer was a man of courage. St. Jerome speaks highly of him and mentions his readiness to accept martyrdom; he also adds that Lucifer sent what he had written to the Emperor for the latter himself to read.[52] Lucifer in fact three times voiced the complaint that Constantius was denying him the glory of martyrdom.[53]

[49] G. Krüger's account of the career of Lucifer, *Lucifer Bischof von Cagliari und das Schisma der Luciferianer* (Leipzig, 1886), has not yet been superseded.

[50] The best edition of Lucifer is that by W. Hartel, *CSEL* 14 (Vienna, 1886): 1) *De non conveniendo cum haereticis,* 2) *De regibus apostaticis,* 3) *De Sancto Athanasio libri duo,* 4) *De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus,* 5) *Moriendum esse pro Dei filio.* In each of these works the Emperor Constantius is addressed directly throughout.

[51] *Moriendum,* 12 (*CSEL* 14, p. 310).

[52] St. Jerome, *De viris illustribus,* 95 (*PL* 23, 697A): "mirae constantiae et praeparati animi ad martyrium contra Constantium imperatorem scripsit librum eique legendum misit."

[53] *De non parcendo,* 13 (*CSEL* 14, p. 236); *Moriendum,* 6 (p. 298); *ibid.,* 8 (p. 300).

When Constantius received Lucifer's manuscript, he perused it in amazement, and instructed Florentius, *magister officiorum,* to investigate whether Lucifer had really dared to write such things about him.[54] Florentius sent a formal enquiry, still extant, to Lucifer, informing him that someone had presented in his name a book "to our Lord and Augustus" *(domino et augusto nostro).* The Emperor had thereupon ordered that it be sent to Lucifer; he wished to know whether the Bishop really was the author of the work. If so, he was to return the book so that it might again be presented to his Eternity *(ut possit aeternitati eius denuo offerri).*[55] Lucifer acknowledged authorship of the volume and sent it back to the Emperor.[56]

There is nothing profound in Lucifer. He is a critic in a hurry. At one point he does pause to observe, however, that a distinction is to be drawn between divine law *(divina lex, iura . . . tradita nobis divinitus)* and the Emperor's authority *(auctoritas regalis);* needless to add, complete and unqualified obedience is due to that law and to those rights divine.[57] The position of the Emperor does not leave Lucifer in awe. Constantius is warned not to pride himself on his "toppling dignity" *(caduca dignitas),* a new term for the *imperium.* Let the Emperor consider himself mortal, for unless he recognizes God, and does his bidding, he will never achieve immortality.[58] He makes it clear to the Emperor that the latter is in grave danger of passing on to eternal punishment with his *temporale caducum fragile corruptibile regnum.*[59] We gather in fact that it may already be too late, that Constantius has for all time damned himself by holding in contempt the precepts of God and clinging to Arianism.[60] If Constantius would but give some thought to what he has done, he could not deny that he is the "prince of all his fellow tyrants" *(tu omnium . . . contyrranorum tuorum princeps)*.[61]

---

[54] *Cf.* Baronius, *Annales ecclesiastici, ad annum* 356 (IV [1739], p. 575, n. lxv), and *Luciferi vita,* 4, in Migne (*PL* 13, 746BC).

[55] *Florentii ad Luciferum epistula* (*CSEL* 14, p. 321).

[56] *Luciferi ad Florentium epistula* (*CSEL* 14, p. 322).

[57] *De S. Athan.*, I, 1 (*CSEL* 14, p. 66).

[58] *Ibid.*, II, 2 (*CSEL* 14, p. 148).

[59] *Moriendum,* 1 (*CSEL* 14, p. 284).

Lucifer tells the Emperor that certain persons find it very attractive to be joined with him in bonds of friendship, for he is Emperor, and so they have adopted his heresy; but theirs will be an experience bitterer than gall when they begin their everlasting torment in an everlasting hell. Then those who chose to be with him can share with him this torment too, but they will say, "Woe to us, for we have preferred the Emperor Constantius to God!"[62] Lucifer grieves for the Emperor's excessive stupidity and extreme facility for evil.[63] Constantius is persecuting the House of God—ignorant, alas, that he persecutes God Himself in that House, for the House of God is the Church, which the Lord inhabits.[64] Lucifer thus like Hosius warns the Emperor not to interfere in the affairs of the Church. The Emperor is compared to the worst Kings of the Old Testament; his resemblance to them is drawn in considerable detail with wearying reference to Samuel and Kings.[65] He is reviled for wishing to subject the Church of God to his imperial power *(subicere velle ecclesiam dei tuo regno)*.[66]

Lucifer's titles of address to the Emperor are in general of three types. He uses conventional terms with stinging sarcasm. Thus Constantius is addressed or referred to as *rex*

---

[60] *De S. Athan.*, I, 24 (*CSEL* 14, p. 108); 25 (p. 110); 36 (pp. 129-30); 44 (pp. 144-45); *ibid.*, II, 1 (pp. 146-47); *et passim.*

[61] *Ibid.*, I, 33 (*CSEL* 14, p. 123); *cf. ibid.*, II, 3 (p. 149), *et passim.*

[62] *De non conveniendo*, 6 (*CSEL* 14, p. 14).

[63] *De reg. apostat.*, 10 (*CSEL* 14, p. 59), *et saepius.*

[64] *De S. Athan.*, I, 34 (*CSEL* 14, p. 126); *cf. ibid.*, I, 42 (p. 140).

[65] *De reg. apostat.*, 1-12 (*CSEL* 14, pp. 35-65).

[66] *De S. Athan.*, I, 34 (*CSEL* 14, p. 125).

prudentissime,[67] *prudentissimus imperator,*[68] *aequissime rex,*[69] *sanctissime,*[70] *iustissime imperator,*[71] *rex piissimus,*[72] *piissime imperator,*[73] and *Constanti imperator immanissime.*[74] He is addressed without particular sarcasm or abuse as *Constanti,*[75] *imperator,*[76] and *Constanti imperator.*[77] He is, thirdly, subjected to an astounding assortment of abusive epithets. Constantius is in Lucifer's judgment (and we must bear in mind one or more of these works actually came into the Emperor's hands) *rex stultissime,*[78] *insulsissime rex,*[79] *Constanti interea imperator, semper insulsissime,*[80] *mendax,*[81] *serpens,*[82] *tu belua, membra et corpus tantum habens hominis, animum vero ferinum,*[83] *agnitus fur atque latro,*[84] *tu antichristi praecursor,*[85] *homicida,*[86] *tu homo tenebrarum* and *tu membrum diaboli,*[87] *rabida fera,*[88] *dei adversarius,*[89] *procurator diaboli,*[90] *diabolo*

[67] *Ibid.*, I, 42 (*CSEL* 14, p. 142).

[68] *Ibid.*, I, 6 (*CSEL* 14, p. 74); 36 (p. 130); *ibid.*, II, 6 (p. 158), II, 29 (p. 199).

[69] *Ibid.*, I, 14 (*CSEL* 14, p. 90).

[70] *Ibid.*, II, 4 (*CSEL* 14, p. 152).

[71] *Ibid.*, I, 24 (*CSEL* 14, p. 107).

[72] *Ibid.*, I, 30 (*CSEL* 14, p. 117).

[73] *Ibid.*, II, 24 (*CSEL* 14, p. 191).

[74] *Moriendum*, 2 (*CSEL* 14, p. 287).

[75] *Constanti* is of most frequent occurrence in all five works.

[76] *De non parcendo*, 1 (*CSEL* 14, p. 209); *et passim* in other works.

[77] *Moriendum*, 1 (*CSEL* 14, p. 284); *et passim* in other works.

[78] *Ibid.*, 14 (*CSEL* 14, p. 313).

[79] *De S. Athan.*, II, 28 (*CSEL* 14, p. 181).

[80] *Moriendum*, 6 (*CSEL* 14, p. 297).

[81] *De S. Athan.*, II, 2 (*CSEL* 14, p. 149).

[82] *Ibid.*, II, 8 (*CSEL* 14, p. 162).

[83] *Ibid.*, II, 12 (*CSEL* 14, p. 169).

[84] *Ibid.*, II, 25 (*CSEL* 14, p. 193).

[85] *De non parcendo*, 11 (*CSEL* 14, p. 232)

[86] *De S. Athan.*, I, 39 (*CSEL* 14, p. 135); *ibid.*, II, 16 (p. 176).

[87] *Ibid.*, II, 17 (*CSEL* 14, p. 178).

[88] *Ibid.*, I, 27 (*CSEL* 14, p. 113).

[89] *De non conveniendo*, 4 (*CSEL* 14, p. 9).

[90] *De S. Athan.*, II, 15 (*CSEL* 14, p. 174).

in nequitiis conpar,[91] *caenum . . . omnium cloacarum,*[92] *negator unici filii dei,*[93] *tu princeps in sacrilegio,*[94] *blasphemiae fundator,*[95] etc. The reader must not assume that this score or so of abusive epithets exhausts Lucifer's vocabulary; far from it, he is an almost inexhaustible thesaurus of invective. In addressing the Emperor and in referring to him, however, Lucifer avoids such titles as *numen* and *aeternitas.*[96] Their connotations and background of Emperor-worship made them unseemly for use by a Christian Bishop.

It may not be without point to observe that Constantius, filth of all the sewers, liar, serpent, beast, and murderer, did little more to Lucifer apparently than change his place of exile from Palestine to the Thebaid. Whether Constantius was anxious to acquire a reputation for the Christian forbearance and humility that Athanasius had ascribed to him at the outset is hard to say. In any event Lucifer outlived the Emperor by a dozen years.

Lucifer's followers who adhered to his too rigid orthodoxy (he had been opposed to showing indulgence to Bishops who had subscribed to the Arian formulary at Rimini) were known to their great annoyance as "Luciferians." They came into some prominence in 383-384 A. D., something over a decade after Lucifer's death, when two of their number, the presbyters Faustinus and Marcellinus, addressed a famous petition from Eleutheropolis to the Emperors Valentinian II, Theodosius, and Arcadius, in which they complained of the cruelty they had experienced at the hands of the Bishop of Eleutheropolis (as Lucifer had before them).[97] Although their opinion of Constantius is much the same as Lucifer's, although perhaps not so violent *(haereticus imperator, patronus haereticorum, haereticus rex)*,[98] to the orthodox Emperors they are addressing they show extreme deference and use a large number of very complimentary titles.[99] Their petition was granted.

---

[91] *De reg. apostat.*, 11 (*CSEL* 14, p. 61). Syntax adapted.

[92] *De S. Athan.*, II, 26 (*CSEL* 14, p. 195).

[93] *De non conveniendo*, 3 (*CSEL* 14, p. 8).

[94] *Ibid.*, 5 (*CSEL* 14, p. 11).

[95] *Ibid.*, 9 (*CSEL* 14, p. 19).

[96] Lucifer does not use *aeternitas*, contrary to the impression given by M. B. O'Brien, *Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography* (Washington, D. C., 1930), p. 10. The letter there cited from Lucifer's correspondence as illustrating his use of *aeternitas* in referring to the Emperor was not written by Lucifer, but was addressed to the latter himself by Florentius (*inter epistulas Luciferi, CSEL* 14, p. 321).

Hilary of Poitiers has been called the western Athanasius, and not alone in doctrinal issues but in his attitude towards the Emperor is he found to resemble closely his Alexandrian contemporary. St. Jerome knew of two works by Hilary that were addressed to the Emperor Constantius. The first is the petition *Ad Constantium* (the so-called *Liber alter ad Constantium*),[100] and the second is the invective against Constantius *(Liber contra Constantium Imperatorem)*, which did not appear until after the Emperor's death.[101] The *Ad Constantium* was written towards the close of Hilary's sojourn in Constantinople, and it may have contributed a reason for his hasty departure from the capital. It is a request direct from Bishop to Emperor, a demand for a fair hearing, " polite and guarded," says Dom Wilmart, " as it should be, nevertheless firm and urgent, menacing almost in the pride of its orthodoxy." [102] It resembles the *Apologia ad Constantium Imperatorem,* which Athanasius had addressed to the same Emperor about three years before, while in the next year (361 A. D.) Hilary's *Ad Constantium* was followed, curiously enough, by the pamphlet *Contra Constantium,* which in its turn closely resembles in content and purpose the *Historia Arianorum* of Athanasius.

---

[97] The petition is known by the (modern) title *Libellus precum* (*Collectio Avellana, Epp.* 1-2, *CSEL* 35: 1, pp. 1-44).

[98] *Libell. precum*, 19, 51, 87, 116 (*CSEL* 35: 1, pp. 11, 20, 31, 41).

[99] *Ibid., passim.* The titles of address are the following: *mansuetudo vestra, piissimi imperatores, vestra tranquillitas et provisio, devota deo religio vestra, augusta mansuetudo vestra, vestra prudentia, piissimi et religiosissimi imperatores, sapientia vestra, mira benivolentia vestra, iustissimi imperatores et catholicae fidei vindices, tranquillitas vestra, piissimi imperatores et rectae fidei vindices, religiosissimi imperatores, vos catholici imperatores, gloriosissimi imperatores.* Theodosius is especially commended for his *mira devotio* (*CSEL* 35: 1, p. 44).

About the same time as the *Libellus precum* was presented to the Emperors, Faustinus addressed a work on the Trinity (*De Trinitate sive de fide contra Arianos*: *PL* 13, 37-80) to Theodosius's wife Flaccilla (not to Galla Placidia, as it is curiously inscribed in Migne). He commends the *regina* highly for her *anima religiosa* and *religiosissima praecepta* (he wrote the work at her request). We have also from the pen of Faustinus a brief confession of faith, refuting a charge of Sabellianism, sent to Theodosius (*Fides Theodosio Imperatori oblata*: *PL* 13, 79-80), in which, however, there is no reference to the Emperor.

[100] The misnamed *Liber primus ad Constantium* (*PL* 10, 557-564) is in part the synodal letter sent in 343 A. D. by the Bishops at Sardica to Constantius (Migne, *loc. cit.*, cc. 1-5: *CSEL* 65, pp. 181-184), which was preserved in Hilary's lost *Liber adversus Valentem et Ursacium.* The remainder of the *Liber I ad Constant.* consists apparently of two sections from the lost work against Valens and Ursacius, one being certain reflections on the activities of the Arians (Migne, *loc. cit.*, cc. 6-7: *CSEL* 65, pp. 184-186)

Hilary asks in the *Ad Constantium* for an opportunity to prove before the Emperor the falsity of the charges that had caused his exile.[103] He wishes also, he tells the Emperor, to raise his voice in a full Council on the subject of Christian orthodoxy.[104] The nature of these requests is in itself of some significance in view of his later attitude. But in 360 A. D. he has no fear of making pious statements before the Emperor about the Divinity, for the Emperor is a " righteous man and religious " *(cum sis bonus ac religiosus)*, and this chance to address him in person has been granted to him by God *(et quia mihi a deo praesentiae tuae opportunitas praestita est)*.[105] He

---

and the other a narrative section dealing with the Council of Milan in the year 355 (Migne, *loc. cit.*, c. 8: *CSEL* 65, pp. 186-187). See Dom André Wilmart, " L'*Ad Constantium liber primus* de Saint Hilaire de Poitiers et les fragments historiques," *Revue Bénédictine,* XXIV (1907), pp. 149-179, 291-317.

[101] St. Jerome, *De vir. ill.*, 100 (*PL* 23, 699B-701A): " Est eius et ad Constantium libellus quem viventi Constantinopoli porrexerat, et alius in Constantium quem post mortem eius scripsit . . . "

[102] Wilmart (1907), p. 151.

[103] Hilary, *Ad Constant.*, 3 (*CSEL* 65, p. 198).

[104] *Ibid.*, 8 (*CSEL* 65, p. 203).

[105] *Ibid.*, 1 (*CSEL* 65, p. 197).

might name as a witness in his defense, it is interesting to note, "my religious Lord, your Caesar, Julian" *(dominus meus religiosus Caesar tuus Iulianus)*.[106] But there is a defiant note. Whoever rejects the orthodox truth (of the Divinity of the Word) is antichrist; whoever pretends to be orthodox, and is not, is accursed.[107] It required some courage to say that, even though he had diplomatically prepared the way by pretending to assume that Constantius was a supporter of orthodoxy. He implies, nevertheless, that his admiration for the Emperor is in direct proportion to the latter's orthodoxy *(in quantum ego nunc beatae religiosaeque voluntatis virum te, domine Constanti imperator, ammiror . . .)*.[108] The *Ad Constantium* reveals a proper respect for the Emperor. It is firm and dignified, more so than the *Apologia* of Athanasius. The reader is therefore all the more unprepared for the vituperative *Contra Constantium,* which like the *Historia Arianorum* of Athanasius was not intended for the Emperor's perusal. It displays the same violent change in the language employed in reference to the Emperor as the latter work of Athanasius.

The *Contra Constantium* is not an address to the Emperor, but is in the form of a letter to Hilary's "brethren", who can only be the orthodox Bishops of Gaul.[109] Athanasius, somewhat similarly, wrote his *Historia Arianorum* for the monks in whom he found his chief supporters. The works are much the same in general content and purpose. In large part, moreover, they rhetorically direct their remarks to the Emperor himself by employment of the second person. They are not unlike the five works of Lucifer in this respect, and in his bitter attack upon Constantius it would seem that Hilary was inspired by Lucifer's muse.

Constantius appears to have mellowed somewhat towards the end of his reign, and he had adopted a policy of toleration,

[106] *Ibid.*, 2 (*CSEL* 65, p. 198).

[107] *Ibid.*, 8 (*CSEL* 65, p. 203).

[108] *Ibid.*, 8 (*CSEL* 65, p. 203).

[109] Hilary, *Contra Constantium*, 2 (*PL* 10, 578C). Wilmart (1907), p. 150.

as the western Bishops at Sardica almost twenty years before had recommended to him. From the way Hilary rails at him we may safely assume that the Emperor was enjoying no slight success in converting the orthodox to Arianism. The orthodox were contending against a deceitful persecutor, a flattering enemy, antichrist, Constantius, who did not scourge the back but pampered the appetite. He did not issue proscriptions that led to life everlasting, but gave rich gifts that betrayed to endless death. Constantius did not assail the body, but took possession of the heart; he did not strike off heads with the sword, but slew the soul with gold. He did not dare contest orthodoxy, lest he be conquered; but he flattered Christians to lord it over them. He paid lip service to God, but purposed that none should believe him the Father.[110] Who could reprove Hilary for calling such a man antichrist?[111]

Hilary expresses the pious wish, so far as he is concerned, to have back the good old days of torture by the "little horse" *(equuleus)*, the stocks, fire, and the axe.[112] He attacks Constantius with a courage he appears to have found only after leaving Constantinople and the Emperor's presence, "I therefore cry aloud to you, Constantius, what I would have said to Nero, what Decius and Maximian would be hearing from me. You are fighting against God, you are raging against the Church, you are persecuting the Saints. You hate those who proclaim Christ. You are overthrowing religion. You are a tyrant not merely in things human, but in things divine . . . You lie when you call yourself a Christian. You are the revolutionary enemy of Christ, the precursor of antichrist. . . ."[113]

Since Hilary's expressed preference for active persecution rather than a toleration that cut a deep swath into the ranks of the orthodox was, of course, only a manner of speaking, he is perfectly consistent when he berates Constantius for the employment of force against Christians. The Emperor is accused of replacing good Bishops by bad ones, imprisoning priests, and seeking by armed might to strike terror into the Church.[114]

---

[110] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PL* 10, 581B-582A).

[111] *Ibid.*, 6 (*PL* 10, 582B).

[112] *Ibid.*, 4 (*PL* 10, 580B-581B).

[113] *Ibid.*, 7 (*PL* 10, 583AB). *Cf. ibid.*, 8 (585B).

Constantius was but a man, declares Hilary, and corrected God; he was corruption and controlled life; darkness, and he illumined light; faithless, and he proclaimed the faith; impious, and he counterfeited piety.[115] Christians recognized him, however, for a wolf in sheep's clothing *(vestem ovis tuae, lupe rapax, cernimus)*.[116] He invites the wolf to hear the awful account of his victims at Alexandria. Trèves, Milan, Rome, and Toulouse *(fructus operum tuorum, lupe rapax, audi!)*.[117] This is all very different from his expressed attitude towards the Emperor in the *Ad Constantium.*

It would thus appear that Hilary of Poitiers like Athanasius himself was more courageous behind the Emperor's back, so to speak, than in his presence. When in the year 360 he had presented the *Ad Constantium* to the Emperor, he had addressed or referred to the latter only in terms of respect *(piissime imperator, imperator pius, pietas vestra, dignantissime imperator, optime ac religiosissime imperator,* and *dignatio tua)*.[118] It is important to observe as an indication of Hilary's attitude towards the Emperor that like Liberius, Lucifer, and other Bishops of his time he does not address the Emperor with titles of cult significance *(numen, aeternitas, perennitas)*. But in the following year, when according to St. Jerome's explicit statement Constantius was no longer living,[119] Hilary regarded him as *tu omnium crudelium crudelissime* and *scelestissime mortalium,*[120] and addressed various other uncomplimentary remarks to him *(lupe rapax,*[121] *diabolici ingenii tui fallens subtilitas,*[122] *O fallax blandimentum tuum,*[123] *Audi etiam nunc impietatis tuae artem!)*.[124] Hilary, moreover, could scarcely answer that the mild and diplomatic *Ad Constantium* was but an example of the moderation which in the *Contra Constantium* he claims to have observed in the past, because he informs us in the same place that he has known for long that Constantius was a peril, a grievous peril to the faith *(gravissimum fidei periculum longe antea praevidens)*,—he has known it for five years, in fact, ever since Paulinus, Eusebius, Lucifer, and Dionysius were exiled.[125] We have therefore his own acknowledgment that he had addressed the words *optime ac religiosissime imperator* to one whom he knew to be a ravening wolf, a grievous peril to the faith. It is necessary, however, to exercise a certain measure of common sense in drawing conclusions from all this. The presence of the Emperor had a very obvious effect upon the attitude which Athanasius and Hilary chose to express. Hilary was not a coward; neither was Athanasius. They were also not excessively brave men, it would appear, and they were not particularly anxious to embrace martyrdom, however highly they might esteem it in others. It was one thing to think ill of the Emperor; it was quite another to stand in the Sacred Presence and speak ill of the Emperor.

---

[114] *Ibid.*, 7 (*PL* 10, 584A); 26 (601B).

[115] *Ibid.*, 9 (*PL* 10, 586B).

[116] *Ibid.*, 10 (*PL* 10, 587A).

[117] *Ibid.*, 11 (*PL* 10, 587B-589A).

[118] *Ad Constant.*, 1-4, 8 (*CSEL* 65, pp. 197-199, 203).

[119] Jerome, *De vir. ill.*, 100 (*PL* 23, 699B).

[120] *Contra Constant.*, 8 (*PL* 10, 585A).

If Constantius had been succeeded at his death by an orthodox and pliant Emperor like Jovian, it may be that the tendency to delimit imperial authority in ecclesiastical affairs would not have continued so strong as it did through the latter half of the fourth century. But the successor of Constantius was Julian the Apostate, and during the latter's brief reign orthodox churchmen came to look back, and with some

[121] *Ibid.*, 10-11 (*PL* 10, 587A, 587B).

[122] *Ibid.*, 17 (*PL* 10, 594B).

[123] *Ibid.*, 20 (*PL* 10, 596B).

[124] *Ibid.*, 20 (*PL* 10, 596B).

[125] *Ibid.*, 2 (*PL* 10, 578D-579A).

measure of nostalgia apparently, to the rule of Constantius as not having been so bad as they had believed. We see evidences of this, for example, in Gregory Nazianzen's two invectives against Julian which were written and published shortly after the latter's death. One would expect that Gregory " the Theologian " like his orthodox fellows Lucifer and Hilary would be inimical to Constantius. But experience of the Emperor Julian, who was far more offensive to all Christians than Constantius had been to the orthodox, together with the passage of a few years that seem to have softened the bitterness of the Athanasians, made it less difficult to respect Constantius as an Emperor and to find excuses for his conduct as a man.

Gregory thus regards Constantius as " the most celebrated of all the Emperors who have yet reigned " (*πάντων . . . τῶν πώποτε βασιλέων ὀνομαστότατος*),[126] a " most excellent " (*γενναιότατος*)[127] and " most humane Emperor " (*φιλανϑρωπότατος βασιλεύς*) ;[128] Constantius surpasses in wisdom and understanding not only the princes of his own day, but also those who have preceded him.[129] He addresses Constantius as " O most divine of Emperors and most loving of Christ " (*ὦ ϑειότατε βασιλέων καὶ φιλοχριστότατε*).[130] It is true that there is no failing or fine quality in Constantius that Gregory neglects to note; references to him range from " a soul that was unsuspicious and not firmly grounded in piety (*εὐσέβεια*) and unable to see the pitfalls in its path " [131] to " one who thought on religious matters in loftier and more noble fashion (*ὑψηλότερόν τε καὶ βασιλικώτερον*) than do most men." [132] Gregory professes to see in Constantius's apparent harassing of the orthodox nothing more than an effort to force upon them unanimity of spirit and freedom from

[126] Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.*, IV, 3 (*PG* 35, 533A).
[127] *Ibid.*, 48 (*PG* 35, 573A).
[128] *Ibid.*, 22 (*PG* 35, 549C), 31 (557B).
[129] *Ibid.*, 34 (*PG* 35, 561A).
[130] *Ibid.*, 34 (*PG* 35, 560D).
[131] *Orat.* V, 16 (*PG* 35, 685A).
[132] *Orat.* IV, 37 (*PG* 35, 564A).

schism: it was not that Constantius disapproved of orthodoxy or sought to gratify the Arians.[133] Gregory elsewhere, however, attributes Constantius's Arian sympathies to simple stupidity and ignorance, though not to any perverse hostility to Christian truth, while he affirms that the Emperor's piety has always held his respect.[134] This most divine and most humane of Emperors, Gregory implies somewhat ambiguously, has worthily discharged " the imperial priesthood increased with abundant toil and with sweat " (*τὸ βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα τὸ πολλῷ πόνῳ καὶ πολλοῖς ἱδρῶσι συναυξηθέν*).[135] It may be said that Gregory was either less astute in matters pertaining to the ecclesiastical polity than Athanasius or the need of exposing and resisting the imperial (and Arian?) policy of subordination of Church to State was at length felt to have passed.

In an apostrophe to Constantius, whom he addresses as though he were in the Emperor's presence, Gregory declares that he knows the Emperor is far above his fault-finding, for he has been placed by the side of God and has thus come to share in the heavenly glory. The Emperor forfeited by death the crown he had worn in life only to receive another crown in heaven. Constantius had been led by God's own hand in his every action and purpose. His prudence was more admired than his courage, and again his courage more than his prudence, and more admirable than his pre-eminence in both was his piety.[136] We are left to infer that Constantius was ignorant and inconsiderate in but a single instance: by not putting Julian out of the way he had handed over the whole world of Christians to a public murderer.[137]

Christian animosity towards Julian is too well known for treatment in the present study. We shall merely indicate therefore the type of language employed by Christians in addressing or referring to the Apostate and try to evaluate its probable effect upon the Christian attitude towards the imperial office. Thus Gregory Nazianzen looked upon Julian as a “ sophist of evil ” (σοφιστὴς τῆς κακίας),[138] “ instructor in impiety ” (διδάσκαλος τῆς ἀσεβείας),[139] “ executioner and ruler, law-breaker and law-maker ” (φονευτὴς καὶ προστάτης καὶ παράνομος καὶ νομοθέτης),[140] and as a man “ most foolish and most impious and most ignorant in great matters ” (εὐηθέστατος καὶ ἀσεβέστατος καὶ ἀπαιδευτότατος τὰ μεγάλα).[141] He set the tone of his two invectives when at the beginning of the first he characterized Julian as “ the dragon, the Apostate, the ‘ great mind ’, the Assyrian, the public and private enemy of mankind, one who has raged like a mad man and threatened much upon earth and who has spoken and meditated much unrighteousness against the sublime.” [142]

---

[133] *Ibid.*, 37 (*PG* 35, 564B).

[134] *Orat.* XXI, 21 (*PG* 35, 1105A).

[135] *Orat.* IV, 35 (*PG* 35, 561B).

[136] *Ibid.*, 34 (*PG* 35, 560D-561AB).

[137] *Ibid.*, 35 (*PG* 35, 561B).

We may also note in this connection the (spurious) letter of St. Basil to Julian, in which the Emperor is reviled for “ exalting himself into a god and insulting the Church, the mother and nurse of all ” (καὶ εἰς θεὸν ὑπεραίρεσθαι καὶ τὴν πάντων μητέρα καὶ τιθηνὸν ἐκκλησίαν ἐνυβρίζειν). Although the Emperor is addressed with conventional titles of respect (ἡ σὴ καλοκἀγαθία, γαληνότατε, and ἡ σὴ γαληνότης), he is warned that whereas it is a grievous thing for the writer, a private citizen *(idiotes)* to address an Emperor *(basileus)*, the latter will find it still more grievous to address God.[143]

St. John Chrysostom, to mention a last example, addressed Julian as “ wretched and miserable fool ” (ἄθλιε καὶ ταλαίπωρε),[144] and asserted that misery and economic disaster had crowned the reign of this Emperor who was hostile to God.[145] Julian had been long dead in Chrysostom's time, however, and if Christians had ever addressed the Emperor thus to his face, their work has not survived.

---

[138] *Ibid.*, 27 (*PG* 35, 553B).

[139] *Ibid.*, 54 (*PG* 35, 577B).

[140] *Ibid.*, 97 (*PG* 35, 632A).

[141] *Ibid.*, 67 (*PG* 35, 588C).

[142] *Ibid.*, 1 (*PG* 35, 532B) ; *cf. ibid.*, 68 (589B).

[143] Basil, *Ep.* XLI (*PG* 32, 345, 348).

[144] Chrysostom, *De S. hieromartyre Babyla*, 1 (*PG* 50, 530).

[145] *Ibid.*, 2 (*PG* 50, 531), *et passim.* Gregory, *Orat.* IV, 75 (*PG* 35,

The heresy of Constantius and still more the apostasy of Julian forced Christian attention upon the problem of imperial succession and the prerequisites of rightful imperial sovereignty. Thus Julian's assumption of the office and title of Emperor Gregory declares to have been an act of self-will and madness. To be hailed Emperor is to possess the supreme title (*ἡ μεγάλη προσηγορία*), to be sure, but the imperial office, Gregory emphasizes, is not to be attained by mere plunder and chance (*ἅρπαγμα τύχης*). It is rather the prize of merit and of character (*ἀρετῆς ἆθλον*). Elevation to the imperial office may be by regular succession (*χρόνος*), by election (*ψῆφος βασιλέως*), or by the decision of the Senate, as in the old days (*τῆς συγκλήτου βουλῆς, ὡς τὸ παλαιόν, κρίσις*). The imperial office is such as not to render the mere possessor of its power possessor likewise of the full measure of its dignity.[146] The imperial power, it is important to note, must be exercised with Christian restraint; otherwise, as in Julian's case, it is improper to speak of anything but tyranny (*εἰ μὴ βασιλικῶς, τυρρανικῶς*).[147] We shall return to this problem with St. Ambrose.

The works which the Athanasians directed against the Emperor Constantius had the incalculable effect of establishing precedents of opposition to the Emperor that were never forgotten and of setting limits to imperial authority that bore ample fruit in the West in the episcopacy of St. Ambrose and in the East in that of St. John Chrysostom. The doctrine that the Emperor was within the Church and not above the Church was Athanasian although St. Ambrose coined the quotable phrase *(imperator enim intra ecclesiam, non supra ecclesiam*

600BC), acknowledges, however, that the economic and administrative reforms of Julian achieved a certain "parade of prosperity", even though it was but momentary.

[146] Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.* IV, 46 (*PG* 35, 569C).

[147] *Ibid.*, 61 (*PG* 35, 584B).

est).[148] The attacks by Christians like Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom as well as the later but undatable Pseudo-Basil, were likewise in a sense attacks not only upon the Emperor but upon his office also. The whole effect was to cheapen the imperial office in Christian eyes. The *sacerdotium* was elevated to a higher dignity than the *imperium* towards the last quarter of the fourth century. The change is difficult to discern in titles of address, however, since they were stereotyped and conventional in nature, although it would appear that orthodox Christians came consciously to avoid all epithets (*aeternus,* etc.) with connotations of Emperor-worship, whereas Arians seem rather to have adopted to some extent the regular titles prescribed by court etiquette.

A more watchful attitude is observable on the part of Bishops in their relations with the Emperor after the sixth decade of the fourth century. They became very conscious of imperial intervention in the affairs of the Church as a problem which it was proper for them to cope with and possible for them to solve. The clearest evidence, however, for the cheapening of the imperial dignity in Christian eyes after the attacks by Athanasius and his fellows, and we shall see how abundant it is, lies in the very considerable limitations laid upon the office of Emperor in St. Ambrose's works and still more the constant deprecatory references and descriptions of that office in St. John Chrysostom.

---

[148] Ambrose, *Sermo contra Auxentium,* 36 (*PL* 16 [1866] 1061B).

CHAPTER V

ST. AMBROSE

In the autumn of 373 A. D. the Arian Bishop of Milan died, and Catholics and Arians alike prepared for a struggle, the former to regain and the latter to hold the bishopric of Milan. To prevent a recurrence of what had happened in Rome seven years before, Aurelius Ambrosius, governor of the province of Aemilia Liguria, in which the see of Milan was located, made an appearance in the Milanese basilica while the election was proceeding and sought by his presence and powers of persuasion to calm an excited gathering. He had hoped to prevent violence, and his hopes were rewarded. But the governor was startled to hear himself acclaimed Bishop by an unknown voice. The crowd took up the cry. The unwilling Ambrose was soon forced to relinquish the consular dignity in order to assume the responsibility of the episcopal office, and something over a week after his baptism he was rather irregularly consecrated Bishop of Milan. We are concerned, however, with the eventful career of St. Ambrose only in so far as it relates to the Emperors with whom he was associated, and that only in so far as it serves to illustrate his attitude towards them and towards the imperial power in general.

For the present we may pass over the first decade of Ambrose's episcopate, and concentrate our attention on his first important conflict with the imperial power and prestige. Shortly before Lent in the year 385 A. D., the Arian Empress Justina, mother of the young Valentinian II, began to agitate for a basilica in Milan, in which her co-religionists might worship, and Ambrose found himself in a struggle with the Empress which had long been impending, ever since, in fact, he had foiled her efforts some five or six years before to have an Arian elected Bishop of Sirmium.[1] When the request for a church had been made to Ambrose, he had straightway refused it. In the midst of the bitter contest that ensued Ambrose wrote a letter to his sister Marcellina, informing her of events immediately after their occurrence, and outlining to her his resistance to the imperial demands. When certain officers had urged him to surrender the basilica, alleging that the Emperor was within his rights, for all things lay in his power, Ambrose responded that if the Emperor sought from him whatever was his own, that is, his estate, his money, or the like, he would offer no opposition, even though everything he had really belonged to the poor, but he insisted that the property of God was not subject to the power of the Emperor (*verum ea, quae sunt divina, imperatoriae potestati non esse subiecta*).[2] When the curt command came, " Surrender the basilica," Ambrose replied that it was neither right for him to do so, nor would it be fitting for the Emperor to receive it. He goes on to say that the Emperor cannot lawfully seize the house of a private citizen, and how absurd for him to think that he can take away the house of God! But it is alleged that there are no restrictions upon the conduct of an Emperor: all things belong to him. The young Valentinian is cautioned, however, not to labor under the delusion that he has some sort of imperial jurisdiction over what belongs to God. He is urged not to exalt himself, but if he is anxious to enjoy a long reign, he had best be subject to God. It is written, Unto God what is God's, unto Caesar what is Caesar's. Palaces belong to the Emperor, churches to the priest. The Emperor was given jurisdiction over public buildings, not over sacred buildings.[3]

---

[1] Ambrose, *Sermo contra Auxentium de basilicis tradendis,* 29 (*PL* 16, 1058D-1059A); *Ep.* XX, 1 ff. (1036 ff.); Paulinus, *Vita S. Ambrosii,* 11

(Kaniecka, pp. 48-50). My references to Migne *PL* 16, it should be noted, are to the edition of 1866, the pagination of which is entirely different from that of the edition of 1845.

[2] *Ep.* XX, 8 (*PL* 16, 1038B-1039A).

[3] *Ep.* XX, 19 (*PL* 16, 1041C-1042A): " Mandatur denique: Trade basilicam. Respondeo: Nec mihi fas est tradere, nec tibi accipere, imperator, expedit. Domum privati nullo potes iure temerare, domum Dei existimas auferendam? Allegatur imperatori licere omnia, ipsius esse universa. Respondeo: Noli te gravare, imperator, ut putes te in ea, quae divina sunt, imperiale aliquod ius

St. Ambrose was ordered to appear before the imperial consistorium to debate with the Arian Bishop Mercurinus Auxentius in the Emperor's presence on whether the basilica should be surrendered. The Emperor and certain lay judges would render the decision. Ambrose refused. Even the most clement Emperor, was his answer, could not recall an occasion when in matters pertaining to the faith laymen had passed judgment on a Bishop. Who could deny, he asked, that in a cause involving the faith Bishops were wont to judge Christian Emperors, not Emperors to judge Bishops?[4] His words will recall to the reader the statement of Athanasius that a judgment of the Church had never received its validity from the Emperor, and that the latter had never busied himself with the affairs of the Church.[5] But it was easy enough, as both Athanasius and Ambrose knew full well, to recall instances of the Emperors' passing judgment upon Bishops. Ambrose, however, appears to have thought it worthwhile to insist that the laws of Valentinian I recognized the principle that decision in matters of the faith should be reserved for ecclesiastics.[6] Whatever the confidence he had in the intrinsic right of his position, Ambrose was too shrewd not to see what was gained by applying imperial sanction to the restriction of imperial interference in the affairs of the Church. Athanasius had had no such imperial legislation wherewith to buttress his position. The attitude of Ambrose towards the Emperor, however, is by and large the same as that of Athanasius, but the former was able, due to the in-

---

habere. Noli te extollere, sed si vis diutius imperare, esto Deo subditus. Scriptum est: Quae Dei Deo, quae Caesaris Caesari. Ad imperatorem palatia pertinent, ad sacerdotem ecclesiae. Publicorum tibi moenium ius commissum est, non sacrorum."

[4] *Ep.* XXI, 4 (*PL* 16, 1046A): "Quando audisti, clementissime imperator, in causa fidei laicos de episcopo iudicasse?... quis est qui abnuat in causa fidei, in causa, inquam, fidei episcopos solere de imperatoribus Christianis, non imperatores de episcopis iudicare."

[5] Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 52 (*PG* 25, 756C).

[6] *Ep.* XXI, 2 (*PL* 16, 1045BC), 5 (1046B); *cf.* for the attitude of Valentinian I towards the Church what is said in Sozomen, VI, 7, and Theodoret, *H. E.*, IV, 6.

creased power of the Church, to push his predecessor's attitude in many particulars to its logical conclusion.

The pagan view that the Emperor was "living law" (*lex animata),* which was of ancient origin but in Ambrose's own day was being propounded in the Greek East by the pagan Themistius,[7] finds absolutely no acceptance in the works and thought of Ambrose. The concept was for obvious reasons repulsive to Christian writers after Athanasius, whose purpose was to restrict, not to increase, the sphere of imperial influence in the lives of men, and it seems to occur in Christian literature only in a novel of Justinian, written on a peculiarly pagan bias.[8] Ambrose declares, however, that when the Emperor has established a law for others, he is bound by it himself, for the laws which an Emperor makes he should be the first to keep.[9] The objective application of a law once made is not to be prevented by the caprice of the Emperor. The very mention of law brings to mind, of course, the "law of God," and Ambrose declares that the law of God is above any law an Emperor could make.[10]

In an apparent renewal of the strife with Justina and Valentinian, Ambrose told the Milanese congregation in February or March of 386 A. D., while the Emperor's soldiers were laying siege to the basilica, which the people had barricaded to protect their Bishop, that the thought of deserting the Church had never for a moment entered his mind. He feared the Lord of the universe, he said, more than the Emperor of the world. If the Emperor was moved to act as Emperors were wont to do, he was prepared to suffer as priests were accustomed to suffer.[11] He emphasized his respect for the Emperors, and, as well, the

[7] Themistius, *Orat.* V (*Ad Iovianum*), 64b (Dindorf, p. 76); *Orat.* XVI (*Ad Theodosium*), 212d (p. 259); *Orat.* XIX (*Ad Theodosium*), 228a (p. 277).

[8] *Novel.* CV, 2, 4: Schoell-Kroll (1905), p. 507.

[9] *Ep.* XXI, 9 (*PL* 16, 1047A).

[10] *Ibid.*, 10 (PL 16, 1047B). *Cf.* for the thought *De bono mortis,* 7 (Schenkl, *CSEL* 32: 1, p. 707).

[11] *Sermo contra Auxentium,* 1 (*PL* 16, 1050AB).

fact that it was not his way to yield to them.[12] He baldly stated that Valentinian was opposed to the faith.[13] Ambrose had been ordered to surrender the church plate to the imperial government. It was a request, it would seem, the fulfilment of which might give Ambrose an opportunity to obey the Emperor in a matter of no great moment and the Emperor an opportunity to spare himself the humiliation of having to allow what must have been construed an open affront to pass unpunished. A man less sure of himself than Ambrose would have taken the opening, and passed through to the chance of amicable reconciliation. But the people of Milan were solidly behind the Bishop, and the Catholic sympathies of the imperial troops in Milan tied the Emperor's hands. Ambrose pressed his advantage. He refused to surrender the plate. He replied that if his own property were demanded, farm or house, gold or silver, anything that was rightfully his, he would give it up willingly, but he insisted that he would take nothing from the temple of God, nor surrender what had been committed to him to protect and not to surrender. Ambrose justified his attitude by asserting that he was taking thought also for the Emperor's safety, because it was no more right for the Emperor to receive than for Ambrose to give up the property of God. Let the Emperor hearken to the words of a priest who dares to maintain his independence (*liber sacerdos*): if he has any regard for his own interests, let him cease doing wrong to Christ.[14] "These are words full of humility," he declared, "and, I think, full of that affection which a priest owes to his Emperor." [15] Christian humility towards the Emperor had undergone a remarkable transformation during the fifty years that separated Eusebius of Caesarea from Ambrose of Milan.

The Emperor's court asked, apparently with indignation, whether the Emperor ought not to have one basilica to go to:

---

[12] *Ibid.*, 2 (*PL* 16, 1050B).

[13] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PL* 16, 1050C).

[14] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PL* 16, 1051AB).

[15] *Ibid.*, 6 (*PL* 16, 1051B).

"and does Ambrose wish to be more powerful than the Emperor, so as to deny the Emperor an opportunity to go to church?" [16] But Ambrose protests they misinterpret his intentions. Must the servants of God, he asks, always be exposed to odium on Caesar's account? Why does impiety cloak itself in the Emperor's name? Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.[17]

In what respect has Ambrose failed to answer the Emperor with humility? If the Emperor asks for tribute, he will not refuse it. The church lands pay taxes (*tributum*); if the Emperor desires these lands, he has the power to claim them. The contributions of the people will be more than enough for the poor. There is no need of ill-will over the lands of the Church; if the Emperor decides to take them, he can have them. "I do not present him with them," says Ambrose, "but I do not refuse them to him." [18] To Caesar the tribute that is due him, but the church is God's, and cannot be surrendered to Caesar; Caesar cannot rightfully possess the temple of God.[19] No one can deny that all this is said with proper honor to the Emperor (*cum honorificentia imperatoris*). For what is there more honorable than for the Emperor to be called a son of the Church? For the Emperor is within the Church; he is not over the Church (*imperator enim intra ecclesiam, non supra ecclesiam est*). A good Emperor seeks to aid the Church; he does not oppose it. Ambrose says all this with no less firmness than humility (*ut humiliter, ita constanter*).[20] There had probably been some truth in Ambrose's remark in the letter to Marcellina that the Emperor had people around who exasperated him (*habet a quibus exasperetur*).[21]

---

[16] *Sermo contra Auxentium*, 30 (*PL* 16, 1059B): "Ergo non debet imperator unam basilicam accipere, ad quam procedat: et plus vult Ambrosius posse quam imperator, ut imperatori prodeundi facultatem neget?"

[17] *Ibid.*, 31 (*PL* 16, 1059C).

[18] *Ibid.*, 33 (*PL* 16, 1060B).

[19] *Ibid.*, 35 (*PL* 16, 1061A).

[20] *Ibid.*, 36 (*PL* 16, 1061B).

[21] *Ep.* XX, 27 (*PL* 16, 1044C).

In the splendid memorial which had been addressed in 384 A. D. by Symmachus to Valentinian II "the Lord Emperors, illustrious, victorious and triumphant, everlasting Augusti" (*domini imperatores . . . inclyti, victores ac triumphatores, semper augusti*) [22] were urged to return the altar of Victory to the Roman Curia and to restore to the Vestals and the pagan sacerdotal colleges their erstwhile privileges and endowments. The Emperors ruled all things, said Symmachus, but they preserved to each one what belonged to him, and justice prevailed with them rather than capricious desire.[23] Symmachus referred to the Emperors with great respect (*principes pii, clementia vestra, aeternitas vestra, inclyti principes, optimi principum, patres patriae, largissimi imperatores, boni principes, divinus animus vester, numen vestrum*).[24] Constantius, Valentinian I, and Gratian were *divi*.[25] But there is no servile flattery in Symmachus, and he cautioned Valentinian II that good Emperors were never guilty of arbitrary confiscation of the property of individuals.[26] While there are thus certain points of resemblance in the pagan and Christian views, as expounded by Symmachus and St. Ambrose, that the imperial office carried *per se* responsibilities for and to the governed, Ambrose's statement that the Emperor was *intra ecclesiam, non supra ecclesiam* contrasts strongly with Symmachus's statement that the Emperor ruled *all* things.

---

[22] Symmachus, *Relatio* III, 1 (Seeck, *MGH., Auct. antiquiss.*, VI, 1, p. 280: 24). These titles of address stood in the *relatio* when it was presented to the Emperor, but Symmachus altered the formula to the simpler *ddd. nnn. imperatores* when he published the work (see Seeck, *op. cit.*, p. XVII and p. 279: 7).

[23] *Ibid.*, 18 (Seeck, p. 283): "Omnia regitis, sed suum cuique servatis, plusque apud vos iustitia quam licentia valet."

[24] *Ibid., passim.*

[25] *Ibid.*, 4, 5 (Constantius); 19, 20 (Valentinian I); 1, 20 (Gratian).

[26] *Ibid.*, 18 (Seeck, p. 283): "Absit a bonis principibus ista sententia, ut quod olim de communi quibusdam tributum est, in iure fisci esse videatur. Nam cum res publica de singulis constet, quod ab ea proficiscitur, fit rursus proprium singulorum."

It is necessary, nevertheless, in comparing the pagan and Christian attitudes towards the Emperor to distinguish sharply between a Pacatus and a Symmachus. Panegyrists like Eumenius, Nazarius, and Pacatus were in a sense subsidized by the government as propagandists. They told the Emperors what the Emperors wished to hear, or more correctly, what the Emperors wished their subjects to hear. However, Probus, Praetextatus, Flavianus, Symmachus, and their fellows, the old Roman aristocracy, had no absurd encomia to pronounce on imperial grandeur; but they did possess a considerably more exalted opinion of the Emperor than their Christian contemporaries because of the Emperor's association with the old religion.[27] In the memorial to Valentinian, Symmachus tells the Emperor that just as each man receives a soul at birth, so, too, do nations receive a genius that determines their destiny.[28] The genius of the Roman Empire, moreover, was thought to be the attendant of the Emperor. Ammianus relates that on the very night before Julian was proclaimed Emperor, he had told intimate friends that he had often been invited, and was then for the last time invited, to assume the purple by the genius of the Empire (*genius publicus*).[29] Shortly before his death the genius of the Empire appeared before him, departed forthwith in sorrow and with veiled head, whereupon Julian knew that he had been abandoned to his end.[30] As for Christians, although the Emperor was, as Ambrose once addressed Gratian, " appointee of God " (*divino electe iudicio*),[31] rendering unto God the things that were God's dominates patristic thought far more completely than rendering unto Caesar.[32]

---

[27] See Symmachus's three *Laudationes* of Valentinian I and of Gratian (Seeck, pp. 318-332). For some of the extravagant titles addressed to the Emperors by pagans in the fourth century note those used by Symmachus in the various *relationes* preserved in the *Collectio Avellana* (*CSEL* 35: 1).

[28] Symmachus, *Relat. III*, 8 (Seeck, pp. 281-282): "Ut animae nascentibus, ita populis fatales genii dividuntur."

[29] Ammianus, XX, 5, 10 (Clark, I, 195).

[30] *Ibid.*, XXV, 2, 3 (Clark, I, 361).

[31] Ambrose, *Ep.* I (*Ad Gratianum*), 19 (*PL* 16, 917A).

Just as all men under the sway of Rome, Ambrose wrote to Valentinian II in the summer of 384 A. D., had to serve the Emperors, so must the latter serve Almighty God.[33] While Ambrose told the young Emperor that he could have proved that the statue and altar of Victory ought to have been done away with by Valentinian's own authority, even if his predecessors had not already done so, Ambrose was, none the less, quick to urge that they had already been forbidden by imperial rescripts (*datis antiquata rescriptis*).[34] If Valentinian, however, granted the pagan petition, Ambrose threatened him, "You may, of course, come to the church, but you will find no priest there, or you will find a priest to oppose you."[35] Although the law of God was superior to the Emperor's law, Ambrose was ready enough, it would seem, to plead the sacrosanctity of imperial law when it suited his purpose.

In response to a request of the Emperor Gratian, Ambrose had written and sent him in August or September of 378 A. D. the first two books of his exposition of the Christian faith (*De fide ad Gratianum Augustum*), and before the end of 380 three more books were added, composed of sermons he had preached against Arianism during the course of the year. In this work Ambrose speaks lightly of his own ability, and sees no reason why Augustus, sovereign of all the world, should turn to him for instruction. He does not write, therefore, in order to teach the Emperor, but rather for his approval. His holy Majesty Gratian has with pious affection cherished the faith from his earliest childhood; since no man has taught Augustus, it must have been God that inspired him with his knowledge of the faith.[36] A year or so later he composed a tract for Gratian on the holy spirit (*De spiritu sancto ad Gratianum Augustum*), in which he declared the Emperor to be so well instructed concerning the Son of God as to be able himself to teach others.[37] Whereas in these two treatises Ambrose claims great knowledge of the faith for Gratian, he nevertheless proceeds to furnish him with most detailed instruction of an often elementary nature; Eusebius of Caesarea likewise had claimed for Constantine a knowledge of the divine will imparted directly to the Emperor by God (ὁ ἐκ ϑεοῦ σεσοφισμένος),[38] but went on to regale the Emperor with a long and wearisome theological discourse[39] only to end by saying " these words of ours, O Emperor, probably seem superfluous to you, convinced as you are by frequent and personal experience of our Saviour's deity."[40] That the Emperors were such consummate theologians is belied by the nature of the works addressed to them, and since neither Eusebius nor Ambrose would have acknowledged the inadequacy of God as a teacher, professing such a high regard for the Emperors' knowledge of Christian doctrine can only be regarded as harmless and almost subtle flattery.

---

[32] *Cf.* Ambrose, *Ep.* VII, 16-17 (*PL* 16, 948B-949A); *Ep.* XX, 19 (1042A); *Sermo contr. Auxent.*, 30-31 (1059BC), 35-36 (1061AB), *et passim.*

[33] *Ep.* XVII (*Ad Valent. II*), 1 (*PL* 16, 1002A).

[34] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PL* 16, 1002D-1003A).

[35] *Ibid.*, 13 (*PL* 16, 1005A): "Licebit tibi ad ecclesiam convenire; sed illic non invenies sacerdotem aut invenies resistentem."

After the usurper Maximus had been defeated and killed in July of 388 A. D., Theodosius began a three years residence in Italy which brought him twice into serious conflict with the imperious Bishop of Milan. The Emperor was apprised late in the year 388, while Ambrose was at Aquileia, that the Jewish synagogue at Callinicum, an important city on the Euphrates, had been looted and burned by certain Christians, allegedly at the prompting of the Bishop of the place, and that a procession of monks in the same district had burned a sanctuary belonging to the Valentinian sect.[41] Such disturbances on the part of Christians had been occurring with distressing frequency throughout the Empire; Theodosius could not overlook the affair and thereby encourage Christians to further violations of the public peace. A rescript was dispatched to the *Comes Orientis* directing that the Bishop responsible for the attack should restore the ruined synagogue at his own expense, that their stolen property should be returned to the Jews, and that the monks and others who had been guilty of rioting should be punished. The Emperor's judgment does not appear to have been unjust. St. Ambrose, however, considered the proposed measures excessive, and he addressed a letter of remonstrance to Theodosius, who was then at Milan. Ambrose, it is necessary to concede, was less interested in justice than in what he believed to be the best interests of the Church. His attitude in the affair of Callinicum would seem to be scarcely reconcilable with the principle he expressed in his *De officiis ministrorum* that it is justice which strengthens the State and injustice that weakens it.[42] But Ambrose clearly implies throughout this letter that when the interests of the State (and of justice!) clash with those of the Church, decision must be rendered in favor of the Church.

---

[36] Ambrose, *De fide*, I, 1-2 (*PL* 16, 549A-551A): "Tu . . . sancte imperator Gratiane . . . fidem meam audire voluisti . . . neque tu unius gentis, sed totius orbis Augustus fidem libello exprimi censuisti: non ut disceres, sed ut probares. Quid enim discas, imperator Auguste, quam ab ipsis incunabulis pio fovisti semper affectu? . . . Quod enim nemo te docuit, utique Deus auctor infudit."

[37] Ambrose, *De spiritu sancto*, I, 19 (*PL* 16, 737B): ". . . ita plene de Dei Filio, clementissime imperator, instructus es, ut ipse iam doceas . . ."

[38] Eusebius, *De laudibus Constantini*, 11 (*PG* 20, 1376A: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 223), and *passim* for the thought.

[39] *Ibid.*, especially 11-17.

[40] *Ibid.*, 18 (*PG* 20, 1437CD; Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 259).

After a proper expression of humility Ambrose tells Theodosius that it is neither fitting for an Emperor to deny freedom of speech (*libertas dicendi*), nor for a Bishop not to say what he thinks. Theodosius is informed that Emperors can possess no quality more popular than a willingness to accord freedom to others, even those bound to serve them by military allegiance (*obsequio militiae*). The difference between good and bad princes is that the good approve of freedom, the bad servitude. There is, moreover, nothing in a priest so fraught with peril before God, so contemptible before men, as not freely to give voice to his convictions.[43]

---

[41] Ambrose, *Epp.* XL and XLI; Paulinus, *Vita S. Ambrosii*, 22 (Kaniecka, p. 62): Th. Foerster, *Ambrosius Bischof von Mailand* (1884), pp. 60-64; J.-R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'empire romain* (1933), pp. 205-221; F. H. Dudden, *Life and Times of St. Ambrose*, II (1935), pp. 371-379.

[42] *De officiis*, II, 19 (*PL* 16, 136C): "Claret ergo quoniam et aequitas imperia confirmet, et iustitia dissolvat. Nam quomodo potest malitia regnum possidere, quae ne unam quidem privatam potest regere familiam?" *Cf. ibid.*, I, 28 (66C-67A).

His Imperial Clemency should be displeased by a Bishop's silence, and pleased by his freedom of expression, for whereas the Emperor might be caught in the peril of such silence, he must needs derive benefit from the Bishop's outspokenness. Ambrose is moved in the present matter not from an officious desire to meddle in what does not concern him, he declares, but rather from his love and respect for Theodosius and from his zealous regard for the latter's safety. In any event Ambrose must speak out from his fear of offending God.[44] Ambrose is well aware that the Emperor is "pious, clement, merciful, and gentle" *(pius, clemens, mitis, atque tranquillus)*. He acknowledges his own indebtedness to Theodosius for many kindnesses and courtesies; all the deeper, therefore, is his anxiety to save the Emperor from a fall.[45] Ambrose rightly intimates that Theodosius would have done well to call for the Bishop's own statement of what had happened instead of summarily imposing punishment upon him, but he waives the point so easily that one suspects the charge against the Bishop of Callinicum was well founded.[46]

---

[43] *Ep.* XL (*Ad Theodosium*), 2 (*PL* 16, 1148C): "...hoc interest inter bonos et malos principes, quod boni libertatem amant, servitutem improbi. Nihil etiam in sacerdote tam periculosum apud Deum, tam turpe apud homines, quam quod sentiat, non libere denuntiare."

[44] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PL* 16, 1149A).

[45] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PL* 16, 1150AB).

[46] *Ibid.*, 6 (*PL* 16, 1150C).

Ambrose protests to the Emperor that the Bishop, when presented with the imperial command, would have to choose between becoming an apostate or martyr (*praevaricator aut martyr*). In Ambrose's eyes to rebuild a Jewish synagogue would be tantamount to apostasy while the penalty for refusing to obey the Emperor's command could mean martyrdom for the Bishop. Neither the one nor the other, says Ambrose, could be to the Emperor's advantage.[47] But Ambrose urges that Theodosius impute the crime to him, if he regards it as a crime; Ambrose is guilty, and he openly affirms it. He has not burned the synagogue in Milan, because he expected no punishment. Why should he do that which would remain unavenged—and so unrewarded? [48] Theodosius is reminded of Julian's ill-fated attempt to restore the temple at Jerusalem,[49] and of how many churches were burned by Jews during Julian's reign, and no restoration of them ever sought or ordered.[50] Ambrose, who had been himself a provincial governor, could appreciate the Emperor's desire to maintain order (*disciplina*). But what is of greater importance, he asks, a display of law and order or the Christian religion? [51] Although Ambrose has not read that the Emperor's command has been revoked, he would, nevertheless, venture to assume that such is already the case.[52] Ambrose closes the lengthy epistle, which does him small credit, with the warning, "I have tried to make you listen to me in the palace, that you might not find it necessary to listen to me in the church." [53]

Theodosius paid no attention to this appeal that he circumvent justice in the name of Christ. The Emperor, however, had already decided that he had been too harsh in demanding reparation of the synagogue by the Christian Bishop, and he had modified his previous command to the extent of making the city or state treasury assume the expense. But Ambrose was not satisfied, and upon his return to Milan he preached a sermon in the Sacred Presence. It was a dull and confused discourse, but he brought it to a close with a comparison of himself and Nathan, Theodosius and David.[54] As he spoke, he grew warmer, and at length he turned directly to the Emperor. The congregation must have held its breath in excited anticipation of what was to come. " No longer, O Emperor, will I only speak about you," he said, " but I will address you directly! " The censures of the Lord are severe, he declared, and the more illustrious the Emperor becomes, the more humbly he must submit to his Maker.[55] When he had descended from the pulpit (*exedra*), the Emperor said to him, " So you have preached a sermon at me! " (*De nobis proposuisti!*) Ambrose replied that it was for the Emperor's own good (*utilitas tua*). Theodosius mentioned the modification of his previous decision, but the monks, he said, were a bad lot (*monachi multa scelera faciunt*). Then Timasius, a famous general and later commander-in-chief of the army that marched against Eugenius, launched into a tirade against the monks, but Ambrose cut him short with the proud remark that he dealt with the Emperor as was fitting, because he knew the latter feared God; but as for Timasius, who spoke so rudely, he would deal with him differently.[56] Obviously, if the Emperor had lacked the redeeming fear of God, he would also have dealt differently with Theodosius. Before Ambrose would offer the sacrifice for the Emperor, he extracted from him the promise to rescind his orders entirely and direct the *Comes Orientis* completely to quash the inquiry against the Christians of Callinicum. " And so," he writes to his sister, " everything turned out as I had wanted it." [57] And so bigotry and prejudice gained a victory over law and order. When the interests of Church and State were thought to be opposed, Ambrose wrung from the Emperor a judgment in favor of the Church. Theodosius was obliged five years later (393 A. D.) to promulgate a law reminding overzealous Christians that the religion of the Jews was not proscribed, and forbidding the spoliation and destruction of synagogues under threat of a punishment equal to the seriousness of the offense (*congrua severitas*).[58] A little *severitas* in the affair of Callinicum might have saved the imperial government the trouble of dealing with constant anti-Jewish outbreaks. But Theodosius dared not fight against the immense influence the Bishop of Milan had acquired in northern Italy, because he appears to have suspected, and probably with good reason, that Ambrose was not above arousing against him the fanatical opposition of the Catholic population of Milan. The humiliation of Valentinian II and of the Empress Justina must have been fresh in both their minds. Theodosius had not been long in Italy; he would have been unwise to provoke the hostility of Ambrose. The latter was astute enough to perceive that humiliation was his most effective weapon, and he drove it deep within the chinks in the imperial armor. He was doubtless motivated by a desire to establish the superiority of *sacerdotium* over *imperium,* not from any personal delight he might take in wielding the greater power, but from the sincere conviction that only thus could the independence of the Church be insured. His tactics were much less commendable than his courage. He sometimes laid his differences with the Emperor before the huge Milanese congregation, and aroused them to a great pitch of opposition to their sovereign. In the contest with Valentinian II, for example, he urged the congregation besieged in the New Basilica to let their Bishop enter the lists alone to meet the imperial adversary (and Auxentius) who was challenging them.[59] A city is always anxious, he said, to present for competition its favorite athlete; and so let the contest with the Emperor (and Auxentius) take place—the congregation, however, must be spectators only;[60] he wished no harm to come to them.[61] He had, nevertheless, taken pains to acquaint them with every detail of the quarrel with Valentinian; he had introduced antiphonal singing to keep the crowds occupied, it would seem, during the hour to hour vigil in the basilica, lest they should desert him in the crucial days of the struggle.[62] Alone he would have been powerless, and he revealed his desire alone to do battle with the Emperor only after the congregation had barricaded the basilica, and the Emperor's troops had laid siege to it. The athlete had discovered his desire to enter the contest for his city only after the city had locked its gates to keep him at home.

---

[47] *Ibid.*, 6-7 (*PL* 16, 1151A).

[48] *Ibid.*, 8 (*PL* 16, 1151B).

[49] *Ibid.*, 12 (*PL* 16, 1152C-1153A).

[50] *Ibid.*, 15, 18 (*PL* 16, 1154AB, 1155AB).

[51] *Ibid.*, 11 (*PL* 16, 1152B).

[52] *Ibid.*, 9 (*PL* 16, 1152A); *cf. ibid.*, 31 (1159B).

[53] *Ibid.*, 33 (*PL* 16, 1160A).

---

[54] *Ep.* XLI, 25 (*PL* 16, 1167D-1168A).

[55] *Ibid.*, 26 (*PL* 16, 1168A).

[56] *Ibid.*, 27 (*PL* 16, 1168C): "Ego cum imperatore ago ut oportet, quia novi quod habeat Domini timorem; tecum autem aliter agendum, qui tam dura loqueris." *Cf.* Paulinus, *Vita S. Ambrosii*, 23 (Kaniecka, p. 64).

---

[57] *Ibid.*, 28 (*PL* 16, 1168D-1169A).

[58] *C. Th.* XVI, 8, 9 (Mommsen, p. 889).

The mere mention together of the names of St. Ambrose and the Emperor Theodosius calls at once to mind the massacre of Thessalonica and the subsequent penance of the Emperor. In midsummer of 390 A. D. the mob in Thessalonica, resentful of the presence of imperial troops, who threw their city into confusion, gave vent to their animosity in a considerable riot, and heaped insults upon the Emperor.[63] Their exasperation had been increased by the imprisonment of a favorite charioteer by order of the barbarian commandant of the local garrison; the latter was brutally killed in the outbreak, and his body dragged through the city streets.[64] Theodosius was thrown into a violent rage when he learned the news of what had happened, and being estranged at the time from Ambrose, whom he had cut off from all association with the imperial consistorium,[65] contemplated a decimation of the populace as punishment for their offense. Ambrose risked the Emperor's displeasure by presenting several petitions before the court, in which he pronounced the punishment, the nature of which had been intimated to him, as "most heinous" (*atrocissimum*).[66] Paulinus, secretary and biographer of Ambrose, states that Theodosius promised the Bishop that the city would be pardoned.[67] Theodosius, nevertheless, perhaps yielding to the pressure of army influence at court, "gave orders that a set number of the citizens be put to death without distinction."[68] The circus-loving populace of the city were invited to attend a spectacle,[69] and when they had assembled in a crowd adequate for the intended butchery, the signal for their mass execution was given. The historian Theodoret says that seven thousand were killed.[70] We need recount here no further details of the massacre of Thessalonica; the story is well known, and has often been told.[71]

---

[59] *Sermo contr. Auxent.*, 4 (*PL* 16, 1050D).

[60] *Ibid.*, 6 (*PL* 16, 1051BC).

[61] *Ibid.*, 4 (*PL* 16, 1050C).

[62] *Ibid.*, 34 (*PL* 16, 1060C). Paulinus, *Vita S. Ambrosii*, 13 (Kaniecka, p. 52). *Cf.* Augustine, *Confess.*, IX, 7.

[63] John Malalas, *Chronographia*, XIII (*PG* 97, 517BC-520A); Theophanes, *Chronographia, anno mundi* 5884 (*PG* 108, 208A); George Cedrenus, *Historiarum compendium* (*PG* 121, 605A).

[64] Sozomen, VII, 25 (*PG* 67, 1493B); Theodoret, *H. E.*, V, 17 (Parmentier, *GCS* 19, p. 307).

---

[65] Ambrose, *Ep.* LI, 2-3 (*PL* 16, 1160BC).

[66] *Ibid.*, 6 (*PL* 16, 1161B).

[67] Paulinus, *Vita S. Ambrosii*, 24 (Kaniecka, p. 64): "Promiserat enim illi imperator se veniam daturum civibus supradictae civitatis..." Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, V, 26, doubtless got his information from Paulinus, who had written Ambrose's life at the request of Augustine (*Vita S. Ambros.*, 1: Kaniecka, p. 38).

[68] Sozomen, VII, 25 (*PG* 67, 1493B).

[69] Rufinus, *H. E.*, XI (II), 18 (Schwartz-Mommsen, *GCS* 9, p. 1023).

[70] Theodoret, *H. E.*, V, 17 (Parmentier, *GCS* 19, p. 307).

[71] The best recent accounts are in J.-R. Palanque (1933), pp. 227-250, 536-539, and F. H. Dudden, II (1935), pp. 381-392. Ambrose's insistence that the Emperor do penance after the massacre of Thessalonica indirectly inspired the fifth century historians to the famous but fantastic tale of the Bishop's dramatic expulsion of the Emperor from the very threshold of the basilica in Milan (Sozomen, VII, 25; Theodoret, V, 18). How the fifth century chose to interpret Ambrose's attitude towards the Emperor is not part of the present subject, but the interested reader should consult: Fr. Van Ortroy, "Les vies grecques de S. Ambroise et leurs sources," *Ambrosiana* (Milan, 1897), and "Saint Ambroise et l'empereur Théodose,"

When the news from Thessalonica reached Ambrose at Milan, the Emperor was still at Verona; his residence there extended from August 18 to at least September 8, 390 A. D.[72] When he returned to Milan, Ambrose withdrew from the city; a day or two later he sent Theodosius the letter, famous now, but secret then, in which he told the latter that communion

---

Analecta Bollandiana, XXIII (1904), pp. 417-426; Hugo Koch, "Die Kirchenbusse des Kaisers Theodosius d. Gr. in Geschichte und Legende," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, XXVIII (1907), pp. 257-277; Chrysostomus Baur, "Zur Ambrosius-Theodosius-Frage," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, XC (1908), pp. 401-409. Van Ortroy revealed the fictitious character of the episode, but believed the source of the extraordinary accounts in Sozomen and Theodosius was the simple statement in Paulinus, *Vita S. Ambros.*, 24 (Kaniecka, p. 66): "(Ambrosius) copiam imperatori ingrediendi ecclesiam denegavit..." Koch in general supported the contentions of Van Ortroy. Dom Baur, *op. cit.*, p. 403, observes, however, that it is unlikely that the Latin work of Paulinus, the earliest known translation of which into Greek dates from the eighth or ninth century, was the source elaborated by Sozomen and Theodoret. Baur points out that there existed already in Greek patristic literature even before the massacre of Thessalonica a famous *Kirchentür-Szene* described by St. John Chrysostom in a work written about 382 A. D. (*De S. Babyla contra Iulianum et gentiles*, 5-6: *PG* 50, 539-542), in which St. Babylas, Bishop of Antioch, is depicted as refusing an allegedly Christian Emperor (Philip the Arabian?) admittance to the church during the Easter Eve vigil of 244 A. D. after the Emperor had treacherously killed an innocent boy held as hostage (*cf.* Eusebius, *H. E.*, VI, 34). Sozomen lived and wrote in Constantinople and his *Ecclesiastical History* shows an intimate knowledge of the life and works of Chrysostom while Theodoret was a fellow countryman and also a great admirer of Chrysostom (Baur, *op. cit.*, p. 406). This church-door scene, moreover, worked its way into the lives of other saints than Babylas and Ambrose (Baur, *op. cit.*, pp. 406-409). Theodore of Trimithus in the late seventh century A. D. assigns precisely such a role to Chrysostom himself when he represents him as ordering his door-keeper to refuse admittance to the church to the Empress Eudoxia whenever she should come, after she had expelled him from the palace (*Theodori Trimithuntini De vita et exsilio S. Ioannis Chrysostomi*, 15: *PG* 47, col. lxvii). At a later date the same story re-appears in the biography of Chrysostom by the Pseudo-George of Alexandria (Henry Savile, *Opera omnia Chrysos.*, VIII, pp. 217-218); it re-occurs in a later anonymous life of Chrysostom (Savile, VIII, pp. 343-344), and is even adapted in Byzantine hagiography to the life of St. Epiphanius of Cyprus (*Vita S. Epiphanii*, 13: *PG* 41, 37-40).

[72] Palanque (1933), p. 538.

would be withheld from him until he had done penance for the atrocity at Thessalonica.

Ambrose writes Theodosius that the memory of their long friendship remains a great pleasure; he is grateful, too, for the many favors that the Emperor has bestowed upon others at his frequent intercessions. Lack of affection was, to be sure, not the reason why he had failed to meet the Emperor at Milan.[73] Theodosius had denied him access to knowledge of what went on in the consistorium; no matter, he had done his utmost to obey the Emperor's will with all respect and reverence (*verecundia igitur qua potui satisfeci imperiali arbitrio*).[74] With tact and deference he begs Augustus to hear him (*accipe illud, imperator Auguste*); the Emperor has a zeal for the faith, he has the fear of God, but he has also an impetuous nature. He can pass readily from violence to compassion, but on the other hand, when aroused, he cannot control his temper. Ambrose suggests that Theodosius is ill-advised by those around him; if no one choose to calm the Emperor's impetuosity, let no one at least seek to increase it.[75] Ambrose has, therefore, sought in secret to call to the Emperor's attention this need of self-control; he would not run the risk of arousing Theodosius by any act of public provocation. He prefers to be remiss, if he must, in his duty rather than in humility (*malui officio meo aliquid deesse quam humilitati*); he prefers that others should find him wanting in priestly authority rather than that Theodosius should look in vain for a proper paying of respect in one who like Ambrose loved him so very dearly.[76] The Emperor is urged, entreated, exhorted, admonished (*suadeo, rogo, hortor, admoneo*)—it is worthwhile to note that he is not commanded—to make amends for his crime. Ambrose regarded the Emperor as "a model of piety beyond words" (*pietatis inauditae exemplum*), one who had attained to the very peak of clemency (*qui apicem clementiae tenebas*). Surely such a man must grieve for the deaths of so many innocent people.[77]

---

[73] *Ep.* LI, 1 (*PL* 16, 1209D-1210A).

[74] *Ibid.*, 2 (*PL* 16, 1210A).

[75] *Ibid.*, 4 (*PL* 16, 1210C).

[76] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PL* 16, 1210D-1211A).

Ambrose seems to believe that in the stand he must take against the Emperor he has received guidance from heaven. In the midst of his anxiety, on the very night on which he was about to set out, he had seen the Emperor in a vision; Theodosius was coming into the church, but Ambrose was withheld by God from offering the sacrifice (*sed mihi sacrificium offerre non licuit*). Ambrose has written to the Emperor with his own hand, because he wants the latter alone to know the contents of his letter.[78]

But the purpose of the letter was less pleasant than the assurances Ambrose gives the Emperor of the depth of his affection for him. What had happened at Thessalonica was without parallel in history.[79] David had repented; so must Theodosius.[80] Kings before Theodosius had humbled their souls before God; so must the Emperor. Ambrose reiterated his indebtedness and his gratitude to his Imperial Piety; he held the *pietas* of Theodosius greater than that of many Emperors, and regarded it as equal to that of Gratian. The Bishop had no cause to handle Theodosius with obstinacy (*contumacia*), he said, but he did have cause for apprehension in this affair. If Theodosius proposed to be present in the church, Ambrose would not dare to offer communion in his presence.[81] The Emperor would make his oblation when he had earned permission to sacrifice, when his offering would be acceptable to God.[82] Ambrose closed the letter with renewed expressions of his love to the "father of Gratian;" Theodosius's other children, holy pledges (*sancta alia pignora tua*), would pardon Ambrose. He had put first the name of his beloved Gratian, but he loved the Emperor's other children too, and Theodosius himself had his love, his affection, and his prayers (*amo, diligo, orationibus prosequor*). If Theodosius doubted him, however, Ambrose must choose to follow God rather than the Emperor. He closed with the words, " May you, Augustus, in the greatest happiness and prosperity enjoy with your holy children a peace that will endure." [83]

---

[77] *Ibid.*, 12 (*PL* 16, 1212C).

[78] *Ibid.*, 14 (*PL* 16, 1213AB).

[79] *Ibid.*, 6 (*PL* 16, 1211A).

[80] *Ibid.*, 7 (*PL* 16, 1211BC).

[81] *Ibid.*, 13 (*PL* 16, 1212D-1213A).

[82] *Ibid.*, 15 (*PL* 16, 1213B).

Probably no communication from a Father of the Church to a Roman Emperor is so famous as this letter to Theodosius. It is strong and resolute. But Ambrose was well aware that Theodosius was a truly religious man; [84] he had been wont to deplore the death of a single guilty man, and his grief for so many thousands must have been very great.[85] Ambrose had a deep sympathy for the Emperor's plight. The Emperor was not now encroaching upon the rights of the Church; there was no need to carry this affair into the basilica and lay it before the congregation in a bid for their support, as he had done in the struggle with Valentinian over the surrender of the basilica and with Theodosius himself in the affair of Callinicum. This was a different matter. Ambrose took his stand firmly, but not defiantly. Ambrose did not mention that the Emperor must do penance, but his implication in this regard was unmistakeable. It was the regular practice in the Church of the fourth century to impose public penance upon Christians guilty of idolatry, adultery, and homicide. Theodosius had been guilty of homicide terribly compounded, as St. Ambrose brings home to him, and where communion was withheld for the blood of one innocent person, could less be the penalty where so many more had beeen killed? (*An quod in unius innocentis sanguine non licet, in multorum licet? Non puto!*) [86] " You are but a man," he told Theodosius, " temptation has come upon you, you must conquer it. Sin can be removed only by tears and penitence."[87] The Emperor was not above the commandments; his atonement for crime must be like that of any other man.

---

[83] *Ibid.*, 17 (*PL* 16, 1214B): " Beatissimus et florentissimus cum sanctis pignoribus fruaris tranquillitate perpetua, imperator Auguste."

[84] *Ibid.*, 4 (*PL* 16, 1210C).

[85] *Ibid.*, 12 (PL 16, 1212C).

[86] *Ibid.*, 13 (*PL* 16, 1213A). *Cf.* Van Ortroy, *Anal. Bolland.*, XXIII (1904), p. 426.

Towards the end of the summer of 392 A. D. Ambrose delivered the funeral oration on Valentinian II (*De obitu Valentiniani consolatio*) in the presence of the latter's sisters, the princesses Grata and Justa. It was a very cautious performance. Theodosius had given no intimation of what his attitude towards Eugenius and Arbogast would be, and so Ambrose carefully avoided indiscreet references to the nature of imperial power. He sets himself the task of consoling the princesses for the sudden death of their brother. He depicts the young Valentinian as an exemplar of the imperial virtues. He expresses great admiration for the courage of the young Emperor, who had chosen to rescue Italy from the barbarian menace at no thought of the risk it involved for himself;[88] but even the barbarians had such awe of the Emperor *(imperialis reverentia)* that of their own accord they ceased hostilities.[89] When it was said that Valentinian was overly fond of circus-games and the hunt, he abandoned entirely what had been his chief amusement and his favorite sport.[90] Despite a natural disposition to appreciate quantities of food, he imposed upon himself a rigorous abstinence.[91] Valentinian was a model young man. Having heard of a beautiful actress (*scenica*) who had been the toast of the gay set in Rome and the downfall of many a noble young Roman, he sent for her; when she arrived, however, to show his self-control and moral earnestness, he refused even to see her, and sent her back to Rome. Ambrose apparently does not consider the possibility that the young man may merely have changed his mind, for he asks grandiloquently who is so well suited to be a judge of others as the man who is the censor of himself—and of his youth.[92] Valentinian postponed marriage merely to enjoy without restraint the chaste company of his saintly sisters.[93] Ambrose relates that Valentinian would kiss the hands and heads of his sisters, " unmindful of the fact that he was Emperor, mindful of the fact they were his sisters." [94] But this imperial paragon of virtue was as impeccable in his public as in his private life.

---

[87] *Ep. LI*, 11 (*PL* 16, 1212C).

[88] *De obitu Valentiniani*, 2 (*PL* 16, 1418A), 22 (1426A).

[89] *Ibid.*, 4 (*PL* 16, 1419B).

[90] *Ibid.*, 15 (*PL* 16, 1423BC-1424A).

[91] *Ibid.*, 16 (*PL* 16, 1424A).

Valentinian took according to Ambrose a personal interest in the justice, or the lack of it, dispensed by his officers.[95] When the perennial petition for the restoration of the pagan sacerdotal privileges was presented to Valentinian for the second time—it was the pagan party's fourth petition—he refused to grant it, even though the entire consistorium, Christians and pagans alike, advised him to relent.[96] The provincials loved him, and he was devoted to them: he was a humane collector of taxes. " They can't pay what is overdue," he said; " how can they stand any more? " [97]

Ambrose dwells on Valentinian's affection for him and his own love for the young Emperor.[98] He gives a tearful account of Valentinian's eagerness for him to go to Vienne (where Valentinian died so mysteriously) to administer to him the sacrament of baptism; Ambrose had been on his way to Vienne when the bitter news came of Valentinian's death.[99]

It is clear that in this address Ambrose is not so much describing the true character of the petulant young Emperor as he is describing the Emperor that he wished Valentinian might have been. Valentinian was scarcely the model of *arete* and

---

[92] *Ibid.*, 17 (*PL* 16, 1424AB).

[93] *Ibid.*, 36 (*PL* 16, 1430D-1431A).

[94] *Ibid.*, 36 (*PL* 16, 1431A).

[95] *Ibid.*, 18 (*PL* 16, 1424C-1425A).

[96] *Ibid.*, 19-20 (*PL* 16, 1425ABC).

[97] *Ibid.*, 21 (*PL* 16, 1425C-1426A).

[98] *Ibid.*, 27-28 (*PL* 16, 1427C-1428AB), *et passim. Ep.* LIII (*Ad Theodosium*), 2 (*PL* 16, 1215C-1216A).

[99] *De obitu Valentin.*, 26 (*PL* 16, 1427AB).

sophrosyne that Synesius recommended to Arcadius, who was for all his short-comings certainly a good deal more of a monarch than Valentinian II. From Ambrose's funeral oration, however, one might assume that Valentinian had become the ideal sovereign, and that the hope of the world had died. But Ambrose is merely holding a mirror, so to speak, up to the perfect prince and calling him Valentinian II.

After the mysterious death of Valentinian II, Arbogast set up as puppet-Emperor the rhetorician Eugenius. Ambrose wrote to Eugenius in the autumn of 393 A. D. He told the latter that since he had never kept silent before other Emperors, he did not intend to keep silent before the most clement Emperor Eugenius. His trust in God enabled him to tell the Emperors whatever in his own way he had come to perceive needed telling.[100] He referred to his past opposition to the constant petitioning for the restoration of the privileges and immunities of the pagan priesthoods. He recalled that Valentinian II and Theodosius had both yielded to his demands in this matter. He had threatened Valentinian with exclusion from the rites of the Church.[101] When he had given expression to his views in the presence of the most clement Emperor Theodosius, he had not hesitated, he said, to speak up to the Emperor's face (*clementissimo imperatori Theodosio coram intimavi atque in os dicere non dubitavi*).[102] Eugenius was rebuked firmly, but somewhat diffidently, for granting restitution of the temples. The imperial power was great, to be sure, he told Eugenius, but the latter had best pay heed to the greatness of God. It was the Emperor's duty to have resisted with great strength the pressure brought upon him by the pagan party and to have refused what militated against the law of God.[103] In the letter to Valentinian II, seven years before, he had contrasted the Emperor's law with the law of God, and had indicated his refusal to set imperial law above the law of God, for the latter teaches men their duty while the laws of man can impart no such instruction.[104] Although Arbogast, who seems to have murdered the young Valentinian, for whom Ambrose frequently expresses such love, had made Eugenius Emperor, the latter was not implicated in his young predecessor's death, and he had not assumed the purple until some months after it. Ambrose's recognition of Eugenius as Emperor, therefore, cannot be regarded as in any way culpable, and recognition by Theodosius was all, in fact, that Eugenius required to have his position entirely legitimized. The reigning Emperor in actual practice ordinarily appointed a younger associate in the imperial power, who might succeed him at his death; he chose generally, but not necessarily, a son or other close relative. Since such action was taken in the lifetime of the reigning Emperor, he was able to appoint whom he wished as successor. We have already studied a passage in Gregory Nazianzen in which he declares that elevation to the imperial office may be by regular succession (*chronos*), meaning that in due time the senior Augustus dies, and his younger associate inherits the Empire, by election (*psephos*), presumably by the legions, and, thirdly, by decision of the Senate. It was not, he insisted, the prize of effective violence.[105] Such theorizing and attempts to state the valid principles of imperial succession are to be expected in persons of the intellectual capacity of the Fathers, but cases might easily arise, and Ambrose was faced with such a case in the *imperium* of Eugenius, where *de iure* and *de facto* distinctions of power became too nebulous to offer any real guidance. Was Eugenius Emperor or was he a usurper? Ambrose decided he was Emperor, and since he was Emperor, he should be all the more subject to God (*etsi es imperator, Deo subditus magis esse debes.*)[106] Ambrose thus, although scarcely cordial, was entirely respectful to Eugenius. He did not question the legitimacy of Eugenius's power in the autumn of the year 393. It will be important to keep this in mind, for after the defeat and death of Eugenius Ambrose regarded him as an unworthy usurper and attested that he was in hell for taking up arms against his lawful sovereigns. In the meantime Ambrose matched with caution Theodosius's vacillation in regard to Eugenius, and concealed his disapproval of the latter with cool deference.

---

[100] *Ep. LVII*, 1 (*PL* 16, 1225A): "... et confidens in ipso [Deo], non vereor vobis imperatoribus dicere, quae pro meo captu sentio. Itaque quod apud alios imperatores non tacui, nec apud te, clementissime imperator, tacebo."

[101] *Ibid.*, 2 (*PL* 16, 1225C).

[102] *Ibid.*, 4 (*PL* 16, 1226A). Theodosius was offended at this attitude of *in os dicere non dubitare* (*cf. Ep.* LI, 2-3: *PL* 16, 1210AB).

---

[103] *Ibid.*, 7 (*PL* 16, 1226C-1227A): "Etsi imperatoria potestas magna sit, tamen considera, imperator, quantus sit Deus . . . nonne tuum fuit, imperator, . . . perseverantius obsistere et negare quod erat in iniuria sacrae legis?"

[104] *Ep.* XXI, 10 (*PL* 16, 1047B): ". . . legem enim tuam [i. e. Valentiniani] nollem esse supra Dei legem. Dei lex nos docuit quid sequamur; humanae leges hoc docere non possunt."

[105] Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat. IV*, 46 (*PG* 35, 569C).

Instead of granting the pagan petition Ambrose told Eugenius that he should have turned to the priest for advice (*debuisti ab sacerdote consulere*).[107] Ambrose did not attach a higher value to flattery, he affirmed, than to his own soul, but he had paid a just deference to the authority of Eugenius. If Emperors, however, wished deference shown to them, they must allow Christians to show deference to God, who the Emperors themselves were anxious to prove was the source of their own authority.[108]

In the following year, September of 394 A. D., St. Ambrose addressed a very interesting letter to Theodosius. He congratulated the "most blessed Emperor" (*beatissime imperator*) upon his victory over Eugenius. Theodosius had already communicated with Ambrose, and so far as the latter could gather from his imperial Majesty's letter (*quantum ex augustis litteris tuis comperi*), Theodosius believed that the Bishop had abandoned Milan, because he suspected that God had forsaken the cause of Theodosius. But Ambrose was neither so foolish nor so unmindful of the Emperor's merit (*virtus*) and good deeds (*merita*) as not to be certain that heaven would aid his Imperial Piety to reclaim the Roman Empire from the cruel grasp of a barbarian brigand and the unworthy rule of a usurper (*usurpator indignus*).[109] The year before, when writing to Eugenius, despite disapproval of his conduct, he had recognized, as we have seen, the legitimacy of his sovereignty (*es imperator*).[110] When Eugenius was defeated, however, he became a usurper, and when he died, as we shall see presently, he went to hell. Thus does the glory of this world pass away.

---

[106] *Ep. LVII*, 8 (*PL* 16, 1227A).

[107] *Ibid.*, 10 (*PL* 16, 1227C).

[108] *Ibid.*, 12 (*PL* 16, 1228B): "Sed qui vobis deferri vultis, patimini ut deferamus ei [Deo], quem imperii vestri vultis auctorem probari."

Ambrose thanked God for the victory which He had given to the faith and piety of the Emperor; as in the olden days of Scriptural history the divine presence had proved an irresistible aid in battle.[111] Other Emperors had celebrated military successes by erecting triumphal arches or the like, but his Imperial Clemency had made an offering to God, and had wished that priests should thank God in his behalf.[112] Ambrose, although unworthy of the duty and unequal to the task, told the Emperor, nevertheless, what he had done to honor him: "I bore your Imperial Piety's letter with me to the altar; I laid it upon the altar; I carried it in my hand when I offered the sacrifice, so that your faith might speak in my voice, and that the message from Augustus might discharge the function of a priest's offering." [113]

Truly the Lord had been favorable to the Roman Empire, since He had chosen such a prince and parent of princes, whose courage and power had attained to such a pinnacle of triumph and of Empire, and had withal been based in such humility, as to surpass Emperors in courage and priests in humility. What more could Ambrose wish for? What else could he desire? The Christian ideals of piety and clemency had received, we gather, their highest expression in this Emperor.[114] But Ambrose was ambitious for even greater piety and clemency for Theodosius, so that the Church of God, as it rejoiced in peace and in tranquillity for the innocent, might take pleasure also in the absolution of the guilty through the Emperor's clemency.[115]

---

[109] *Ep.* LXI, 1 (*PL* 16, 1237B).

[110] *Ep.* LVII, 8 (*PL* 16, 1227A).

[111] *Ep.* LXI, 3 (*PL* 16, 1237C).

[112] *Ibid.*, 4 (*PL* 16, 1238A).

[113] *Ibid.*, 5 (*PL* 16, 1238AB).

Theodosius died on January 17, 395 A. D. Forty days later Ambrose delivered his funeral oration (*De obitu Theodosii*). He spoke in Milan in the presence of the child Emperor Honorius, the latter's guardian Stilicho, certain troops of the eastern command who had marched against Eugenius with the Emperor now deceased, the imperial court, and the Milanese congregation, who had flocked to hear their Bishop and to pay their last respects to their Emperor. Honorius was ten years of age, and Arcadius was eighteen. Ambrose's experience of youthful Emperors had not been happy, and the memory of Gratian and Valentinian II must have loomed up before him as he spoke. The result was a significant gesture. He made a direct appeal to the army to support the young Emperors.[116] Theodosius had merited the loyalty of his troops; Arcadius and Honorius had inherited that loyalty no less than their father's Empire.[117] "The faith of the Emperor is the strength of his soldiers." [118] "The faith of Theodosius was your victory," he told the soldiers assembled in the basilica; "your own faith must be the strength of his sons." [119] "Pay to his sons what you owe to their father!" [120] In passing we may note the good sense of Ambrose and contrast it with the impractical nature of the exhortations we shall see Synesius of Cyrene make to Arcadius; to recommend the safety of Arcadius to the army makes vastly more sense, as subsequent history was to show, than to recommend the reform of the army to Arcadius.

---

[114] *Ibid.*, 6 (*PL* 16, 1238B).

[115] *Ibid.*, 7 (*PL* 16, 1238B). *Cf. Ep.* LXII (1238C-1239C).

[116] *De obitu Theodosii*, 2, 6-11.

[117] *Ibid.*, 2 (*PL* 16, 1447B: Mannix, p. 46).

[118] *Ibid.*, 6 (*PL* 16, 1450B: Mannix, p. 48).

[119] *Ibid.*, 8 (*PL* 16, 1451A: Mannix, p. 48).

[120] *Ibid.*, 11 (*PL* 16, 1452B: Mannix, p. 49).

Earthquakes, rains, and dense darkness had preceded the passing of the most clement Theodosius. The very elements lamented his death.[121] The passage is suggestive of scriptural calamity. Somewhat similarly, ten years before, Gregory of Nyssa had represented the sun as mourning the death of Theodosius's wife, the Empress Flaccilla, and as veiling its rays with clouds, so as not to behold in bright light the Empress's sad funeral cortege.[122]

Ambrose held Theodosius up to the assemblage as the model of imperial devotion to God, protector of the Church against tyranny, guardian of the poor and the afflicted, dispenser of justice and forgiveness, an Emperor humble and merciful.[123] Ambrose loved the man who had preferred admonition to flattery, who had thrown on the ground the insignia of his imperial rank, had wept publicly in the church for the sin which the fraud of others had thrust upon him, and had prayed for pardon with groans and with tears. At what private citizens blushed to do, the Emperor had not blushed: he had done penance publicly.[124] *Dilexi virum, dilexi virum* was the Bishop's tribute to his dead Emperor. But there was much in the Emperor's death to console those who survived him. Theodosius was embracing Gratian and Pulcheria and Flaccilla in heaven;[125] but Maximus and Eugenius were in hell, showing by their example of wretchedness how terrible it was to take up arms against one's sovereigns (*arma suis principibus irrogare*).[126] But because Theodosius of august memory had loved the Lord his God, he had earned the companionship of the saints.[127]

---

[121] *Ibid.*, 1 (*PL* 16, 1447A: Mannix, p. 46).

[122] Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio funebris de Placilla imperatrice* (*PG* 46, 885A). Calamity is often associated with darkening of the sun in the Old Testament (Isaiah 13: 10, 24: 23; Jeremiah 15: 9; Ezekiel 32: 7; Joel 2: 31; Amos 8: 9); the tradition is continued in the New Testament, and the sun is veiled at the crucifixion (Matthew 27: 45, *cf.* 24: 29; Mark 15: 33; Luke 23: 44-45).

[123] Ambrose, *De ob. Theod., passim.*

[124] *Ibid.*, 34 (*PL* 16, 1459A: Mannix, p. 57).

[125] *Ibid.*, 40 (*PL* 1462AB): Mannix, p. 59).

Now that we have considered Ambrose's attitude towards the Emperors and the imperial power in works for the most part directly addressed to the Emperors themselves, such as letters, dedicatory prefaces and similar passages, and orations, let us turn to Ambrose's scriptural commentaries (it so happens that some of these also were dedicated to Emperors, but their form and approach to the *imperium,* as we shall see, are quite different from those of the works we have thus far considered). Let us see whether the attitude expressed in these commentaries will stand in comparison with or in contrast to what we have studied in the other works. Palanque has observed that Ambrose holds no brief for any political philosophy, and he spends no time contrasting the merits or deficiencies of different types of government. While he never attempts to justify the existence or to demonstrate the excellence of the imperial sovereignty, he accepts it without more ado as *le régime de fait.* That was enough for Ambrose.[128]

We turn first to Ambrose's exposition of the gospel according to St. Luke. There is no power but of God, and the powers that be are ordained of God (Rom. 13:1). Jesus was taken to a high mountain; the kingdoms of the world were shown to him, and the devil said, " All these will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me " (Luke 5:8-9). Thus, whereas God is the source of political authority, it would appear that the devil has earthly sovereignty at his disposal. Ambrose asks, therefore, whether there is not a contradiction here (*num ergo contrarium est?*), and immediately answers his own question in the negative (*minime!*) He draws a careful distinction between the world (*mundus*), which is of God, and its works (*opera eius*), which are of the devil. While earthly sovereignty, therefore, is ordained of God (*ita etiam a deo potestatum ordinatio*), nevertheless, ambition for power is of the devil (*a malo ambitio potestatis*). Although the devil may say that he bestows power, he could not deny that all this has been allowed him only for a time; such permission must thus have come from the source which instituted that power. It is not the power which is evil, but he who misuses the power.[129]

---

[126] *Ibid.*, 39 (*PL* 16, 1462A: Mannix, pp. 58-59).

[127] *Ibid.*, 32 (*PL* 16, 1458D: Mannix, p. 56).

[128] Palanque (1933), p. 349. In this respect his attitude resembles that of St. Augustine: G. Combès, *La doctrine politique de saint Augustin* (Paris, 1927), pp. 85 ff. (cited by Palanque).

"And wouldest thou have no fear of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same" (Rom. 13:3). It is not the power, once again, that is evil, but the misuse of it. He who uses his power well is a minister of God, as Paul said, "for he is a minister of God to thee for good" (Rom. 13:4). Fault lies not in the institution of things, when wrong-doing occurs, but in their administration. But to illustrate things of heaven by an earthly example—the Emperor bestows an office, and reserves his praise; and if anyone misuses that office, it is not the Emperor's fault, but rather the fault of the magistrate concerned. It may be questioned, then, Is it good to use power? to desire to hold office? Yes, it is good, but only if the office comes by proper delegation, not if it is wantonly seized upon.[130] As for Christians, they owe obedience to this authority ordained of God, and no one must take it upon himself to nullify the command of the earthly sovereign (*constitutio regis terreni*).[131]

---

[129] *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucan*, IV, 29 (Schenkl, *CSEL* 32: 4, pp. 152-153).

[130] *Ibid.* (*CSEL* 32: 4, p. 153): "Non ergo potestas mala, sed ambitio. Denique eo usque a deo ordinatio potestatis, ut dei minister sit qui bene potestate utitur... Non ergo muneris aliqua culpa est, sed ministri, nec dei potest ordinatio displicere, sed administrantis actio. Nam ut de caelestibus ad terrena derivemus exemplum, dat honorem imperator et habet laudem. Quod si quis male honore usus fuerit, non imperatoris est culpa, sed iudicis. ... Quid ergo? bonum est uti potestate, studere honori? Bonum si deferatur, non eripiatur."

[131] *Ibid.*, IV, 73 (*CSEL* 32: 4, p. 176).

In his work on David, which was allegedly addressed to Theodosius (*De apologia prophetae David ad Theodosium Augustum*), Ambrose refers to David's sparing Saul's life at En-gedi (1 Samuel 24:6-7), and declares that David thereby taught all men that a kingdom should not be seized from the Lord's anointed, even if it be due, but he to whom the kingdom is due should wait until such time as it shall be delivered to him. This is, I take it, the *chronos* of Gregory Nazianzen. Ambrose expresses the wish that those who had followed David in the possession of royal power had imitated him in this restraint: men would not then have suffered the great and bitter hardships of war![132] Such, then, was the attitude that led him to look upon Eugenius as an unworthy usurper. That he waited until Theodosius should draw cards, so to speak, before playing his own hand indicates no more than that he understood the nature of the game he was playing. If Theodosius had accepted Eugenius as Emperor, Ambrose would have had no alternative but to do the same. Had not Maximus wielded the imperial power for four years without hindrance from Theodosius? Political necessity had forced Ambrose to recognize Maximus as Emperor when in 383 A. D. he had assumed the role of imperial diplomat, and had undertaken his first embassy to Trèves in behalf of the young Valentinian II and his mother Justina. On his second embassy to Trèves in 387 A. D., however, Ambrose, standing among members of the imperial consistorium, had boldly told Maximus, "Gratian was not your enemy, but you were his. . . . If anyone were to decide today that he should usurp from you the Empire in Gaul, I ask you whether you would regard yourself as his enemy or him as yours? Unless I am mistaken, it is the usurper who must bear the guilt of waging war; the Emperor merely defends his rights."[133] Ambrose says that Maximus was in high dudgeon when he left him, and many thought that the Bishop would be waylaid on his journey back to Milan.[134] Ambrose's biographer Paulinus declares that after the second embassy Ambrose refused communion to Maximus and admonished him to do penance for the murder of Gratian.[135] If Paulinus has his facts straight, Ambrose took this step a little late. But Ambrose was a statesman as well as a priest, and Paulinus's account may well be accurate. At a later date when he called to mind his beloved Gratian, however, he execrated Maximus as a usurper and a worse than Pilate and as one in whom even the humanity of the parricide was lacking.[136]

---

[132] *Apologia prophetae David I*, 27 (Schenkl, *CSEL* 32: 2, p. 316): "Utinam hunc virum imitati essent posteri! Non tantas bellorum pertulissemus acerbitates."

[133] *Ep.* XXIV (*Ad Valent. II*), 10 (*PL* 16, 1082B): "Non ille tuus hostis,

In commenting on the passage in I Kings 21, 20 ff. (a favorite text with the Fathers for the high-handedness of Kings and their being humbled by God), where Elijah accosts King Ahab in the vineyard of Naboth, and threatens the King with death, Ambrose observes that injury should not without cause be done to Kings by prophets or by priests when the Kings are guilty of no offenses that require correction. When grave sins have been committed by the monarch, however, the priest must not seek to spare him, but the monarch must be reproved by just rebuke.[137] Since the civil authority was ordained of God, it is apparent that priest as well as layman owed the Emperor his respect and his support. But when the Emperor was guilty of a grave offense, as was Theodosius in the affair of Thessalonica, the duty to correct him *iustis increpationibus* devolved upon the priest. Ambrose endeavored not to fail in either aspect of the priest's dual responsibility to his Emperor.

---

sed tu illius... Si quis adversum te hodie imperium in his partibus usurpandum putet, quaero utrum te hostem illius dicas, an illum tibi? Nisi fallor, usurpator bellum infert, imperator ius suum tuetur."

[134] *Ibid.*, 12 (*PL* 16, 1083A).

[135] Paulinus, *Vita S. Ambrosii*, 19 (Kaniecka, p. 58).

[136] *In psalmum LXI enarratio*, 26 (Petschenig, *CSEL* 64, p. 394).

[137] *In psalmum XXXVII enarratio*, 43 (*CSEL* 64, p. 172): "Vides ergo quia regibus non temere vel a prophetis Dei vel a sacerdotibus facienda iniuria sit, si nulla sint graviora peccata, in quibus debeant argui. Ubi autem peccata graviora sunt, ibi non videtur a sacerdote parcendum, ut iustis increpationibus corrigantur."

Ambrose's attitude towards the Emperor in the latter's relation to law is difficult, but, as I understand it, involves no serious inconsistency. In the *Apology of the Prophet David* Ambrose makes the curious statement that the King although freed of the restrictions imposed by the laws has nevertheless a judge in his own conscience (*quamvis rex legibus absolutus suae tamen reus sit conscientiae*).[138] This is not an unconsidered remark, for earlier in the same commentary he had made an issue of the fact that the sovereign is above the laws. David, for example, was a King, and was therefore not bound by any laws, because Kings are free from the penalties of offense, and secure in their sovereign power they are not obliged by any laws to face punishment. David had thus not sinned against man, to whom he was not held responsible. Despite the protection of his sovereign power, however, he was subject to God because of his devotion and his faith, and recognizing his own sin he could not deny that he was subject to the law of God. Like a prisoner before the bar he confessed with bitterness, because he knew that he was really in greater bondage than other men, for he was a King, and so his debt to God was greater. More was demanded of him to whom more had been given.[139]

Since we have already seen St. Ambrose admonish the Emperor that he should himself be the first to obey the laws he passes,[140] we seem to be faced with a serious inconsistency in Ambrose's thought on the question of the Emperor's relation to law. Was the Emperor bound to obey the law or not? I think the inconsistency is more apparent than real. If we turn for a moment to one of Ambrose's letters to his friend Irenaeus, where to substantiate his belief in natural law (*naturalis lex*) Ambrose quotes St. Paul (Rom. 2:14-15), we find that he declares that if men had been able to retain the natural law which God has implanted in all men's hearts, there would have been no need for this other law which is inscribed on stone tablets and has rather entangled and fettered than set at large and freed the weakness of human beings. Natural law is not written, but is innate. A knowledge of it is not gained by reading; but it flows, so to speak, from the very source of nature, and springs up in every man and is drunk in by human minds (*humana ingenia*).[141] The law of nature is the law of God.

---

[138] *Apol. proph. David I*, 77 (*CSEL* 32: 2, p. 350).

[139] *Ibid.*, 51 (*CSEL* 32: 2, p. 333): "Rex utique erat, nullis ipse legibus tenebatur, quia liberi sunt reges a vinculis delictorum; neque enim ullis ad poenam vocantur legibus tuti sub imperii potestate. Homini ergo non peccavit, cui non tenebatur obnoxius. Sed quamvis tutus imperio devotione tamen ac fide erat deo subditus et legi eius subiectum se esse cognoscens peccatum suum negare non poterat, sed quasi reus cum amaritudine fatebatur, qui sciret maioribus vinculis se teneri, quia maior deberet, quoniam plus ab eo exigitur, cui plus commissum est."

[140] *Ep.* XXI, 9 (*PL* 16, 1047A): "Quod cum praescripsisti aliis, praescripsisti et tibi: Leges enim imperator fert, quas primus ipse custodiat."

It is clear, therefore, that in so far as imperial law is just and necessary it has already been anticipated by and must be identical with natural law. The Emperor was subject to the law of God. He had no title more honorable than to be called a son of the Christian Church. He was bound by his own law in all its fundamental aspects which to be valid had to coincide with the law of nature and of God. What difficulty arises thus lies in the fact that Ambrose uses *lex* in two very different senses, and leaves the reader to distinguish between statutory law and natural law. When it is a question of statutory law, the sovereign is indeed *legibus absolutus,* for he need only alter the law to suit the occasion, but he stands convicted by his own conscience when he violates the natural law, and although he is not beholden to man, he must needs face the tribunal of the Almighty. Ambrose is thus not inconsistent when in one place he regards the Emperor as above the law and in another as bound by the law; it depends upon whether it is a question of man-made or natural law. In a given instance it might not be easy to tell them apart.

David had sinned, as Kings are wont to sin, but he had done penance and had wept, and Kings are not wont to do that.[142]

---

[141] *Ep.* LXXIII, 2-3 (*PL* 16, 1305CD). *Cf. De Iacob,* 20 (*CSEL* 32: 2, p. 17).

[142] *Apol. David altera,* 7 (*CSEL* 32: 2, p. 362).

That man is rare, indeed, who when established in power does not come to look upon his own crimes with favor, vaunt his guilt, defend his sins, who does not think that the unseemly is all right for him, who binds himself by his own laws, and who recognizes that what is not permissible in justice is also not permissible because of mere possession of power. Power does not do away with the principle of justice; justice does, however, efface power. The sovereign is thus *not* released from obedience to the laws, but by his bad example he weakens them. Or can it be that the man who passes judgment on others is himself free from his own judgment and may by himself undertake that wherein he binds others?[143] The answer is, of course, in the negative. It is obvious, therefore, Ambrose continues, that the secular power of the monarch frequently is of no benefit to himself or to his subjects. The monarch, in fact, often finds the authority he wields a source of wrong-doing. He must, therefore, beware both of his power and of his opportunity to do evil.[144]

The principle that the Emperor should be bound by law did not originate with St. Ambrose or even his immediate predecessors. Clement of Alexandria, for example, had already at the close of the second century defined a *Basileus* as one who ruled according to law (κατὰ νόμους), and who possessed such knowledge of how to rule that his subjects willingly accepted him as sovereign.[145] But the influence of St. Ambrose upon the centuries that followed him was profound. We see striking evidence of his influence upon a younger contemporary in the scholar and historian, Rufinus of Aquileia, the opponent of St. Jerome and an admirer of St. Ambrose. In the tenth book of his *Historia ecclesiastica* Rufinus has put a curious speech into the mouth of Constantine, which we may safely assume indicates the attitude of Rufinus towards the *imperium* rather than that of Constantine. Rufinus represents Constantine as upbraiding the Bishops at Nicaea for indulging in private quarrels. God had made them priests, Constantine declares, and had given them the authority to judge all Christians while they could not themselves be judged by men. He implies that he has no right of jurisdiction over Bishops; he urges them to attend to those spiritual matters that were then requiring such attention, and makes the tacit acknowledgment of the limitations of his own power in such matters.[146]

---

[143] *Ibid.*, 8 (*CSEL* 32: 2, pp. 362-363).

[144] *Ibid.*, 10 (*CSEL* 32: 2, p. 363).

[145] Clement Alex., *Stromata*, I, 24 (Dindorf, II, 128).

Ambrose like all the Fathers who gave much thought to the *imperium* tended to deprecate the desirability of possessing such power. In one of his letters he observes in much the manner of St. John Chrysostom that the condition of Kings is miserable, the state of Empire is subject to constant change, the span of life is short, and even in the possession of Empire is there servitude, for Emperors live according to the will of others, not their own.[147]

Some slight comment and consideration have already been directed in the course of this chapter to terms of address and reference as used of the Emperor by St. Ambrose. Although a perusal of his correspondence shows that he addressed his fellow Bishops in rather reserved tones, he used imperial epithets, interestingly enough, with considerable exuberance. Such epithets are more or less the same in his letters as in his dedicatory prefaces and orations where the Emperors are addressed or mentioned. About twenty different abstract nouns (*pietas, felicitas,* etc.) are used as conventional terms of address to the Emperors in the extant epistolary literature of the late Empire, and half of them are confined to Emperors alone, not being used also of high officials or ecclesiastics.[148] If adjectives (*pius, felix,* etc.) are added, we have a list of more than fifty titles addressed (almost half of them exclusively) to the Emperor in Latin epistolary remains of the fourth and fifth centuries.[149] Although certain of these titles rarely occur, it is obvious that the titles chosen by an individual from this abundant assortment may be considered in a general way to illustrate his attitude towards the Emperor.

---

[146] Rufinus, *H. E.*, X (I), 2 (Schwartz-Mommsen, *GCS* 9, p. 961).

[147] *Ep.* XXIX, 18 (*PL* 16, 1104A).

[148] M. B. O'Brien, *Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography* (Washington, D. C., 1930), p. 9.

In the memorial of Symmachus presented to the young Emperor Valentinian II we observed that the Emperors were spoken of as *aeternitas vestra* and *numen vestrum*; Symmachus elsewhere calls the Emperors *perennitas vestra* and *maiestas vestra.*[150] Ambrose in common with all the other orthodox Fathers of the fourth century (the reader will recall, as examples, Liberius, Lucifer, and Hilary of Poitiers) uses none of these titles of the Emperors. We can understand his attitude more clearly still, if it needed further clarification, when we find that he reserves the title *aeternus imperator* for God.[151] Ambrose uses in reference to the Emperors *clementia* and *clementissimus* frequently, *tranquillus* and *tranquillitas* often, *pietas* very often (but apparently not *piissimus*), *augustus imperator, gloria, mansuetudo, dominus, gloriosissimus, sanctus, beatissimus, fidelissimus,* and *Christianissimus.*[152] It was thus the Christianity of the Emperors rather than their imperial Majesty that Ambrose appears to have found most noteworthy.[153] In the first letter of his extant correspondence he calls the Emperor Gratian "most Christian prince" (*Christianissime principum*), and he adds significantly that he knows no title truer and more glorious than this one.[154] While the use of these diverse titles in sonorous and impressive combinations cannot perhaps be called flattery—and Ambrose protests in the same letter to Gratian that he considered flattery foreign to the priestly office[155]—it must be agreed that Ambrose made the most of accepted convention in addressing the Emperors, whereas on the other hand he practiced very considerable restraint in his salutations to his fellow Bishops.

---

[149] O'Brien (1930), p. 166. *Cf.* A Engelbrecht, *Das Titelwesen bei den spätlateinischen Epistolographen* (Vienna, 1893), pp. 53-59.

[150] Engelbrecht (1893), pp. 9-10.

[151] Ambrose, *De off.*, I, 244 (*PL* 16, 95C).

[152] The references in my own notes so far as the letters of Ambrose are concerned are all included and more in Engelbrecht (1893), pp. 20-21, and O'Brien (1930), *sub vocc. citt.*

[153] *Cf.* Engelbrecht (1893), p. 21.

[154] *Ep.* 1, 1 (*PL* 16, 914B).

More interesting than the conventional epithets, however, are those which contain a personal note of affection or of antipathy. Gratian is informally addressed as *fili Gratiane, suavis mihi valde,*[156] while the young Valentinian is *O iuvenis optime*[157] and *fili Valentiniane, speciosus mihi valde;*[156] they are referred to together as *O mihi Gratiane et Valentiniane speciosi et carissimi*[158] and *Hei mihi qualia amisi pignora!*[156] But he did not love everyone who wore the purple, and he compared the Arian Empress Justina with Eve, who betrayed Adam, Jezebel, who persecuted Elijah, and Herodias, who caused the death of John the Baptist.[159] He seldom lost his temper in this way, however, unlike St. John Chrysostom, who could be aroused by imperial misconduct to voluble abuse. Bold and direct, bluntly honest as he was, Ambrose was an attractive figure, and he was probably sincerely liked by most members of the imperial family. His gentle efforts to console the princesses Grata and Justa at the tragic death of their young brother are often lost to sight in the formidable picture of the commanding Bishop who dared rebuke Emperors. But his affection for Grata and Justa would seem to have been genuine: they were *sanctae animae*[160] and his *sanctae filiae.*[161]

No distinction was made by the Fathers, and indeed none such was possible in the fourth century, between the Emperor and the State. St. Optatus of Milevis in Numidia, a provincial Bishop, was a generation behind his time (he still shared, it would appear, the attitude of Eusebius) when he asserted that the State was not in the Church, but the Church was in the State, that is, the Roman Empire (*non enim respublica est in ecclesia, sed ecclesia in republica, id est in imperio Romano*).[162] Athanasius had contended to the contrary, however, and Ambrose himself put the Athanasian attitude towards the Emperor succinctly when he reversed the dictum of St. Optatus, and declared that the Emperor was within the Church, not over the Church (*imperator enim intra ecclesiam, non supra ecclesiam est*).[163] But the Emperors were not excluded from important functions in the service of the Church; they were merely refused arbitrary leadership of the Church. Athanasius had recognized as the Emperor's chief right in the Church the duty of summoning church councils, especially ecumenical councils,[164] and he had even addressed an appeal to the Emperor Constantius, as we have seen, for the Emperor himself to judge the justice of his cause.[165] Ambrose like Athanasius and all the Fathers of the fourth century accorded the Emperor the privilege and responsibility of summoning church councils.[166] This must mean that the Emperor was thought to possess certain rights of a judicial and disciplinary character over the episcopate; it was in causes involving the faith that Athanasius and Ambrose protested against imperial intervention.[167]

---

[155] *Ibid.*, 2 (*PL* 16, 915A): "nihil . . . adulationis est, quam . . . ego alienam nostro duco officio."

[156] *De obitu Valentiniani*, 80 (*PL* 16, 1444A).

[157] *Ibid.*, 27 (*PL* 16, 1427B).

[158] *Ibid.*, 79 (*PL* 16, 1443B).

[159] *Ep.* XX, 17-18 (*PL* 16, 1041AB).

[160] *De obitu Valenti.*, 38 (*PL*, 1431B).

[161] *Ibid.*, 40 (*PL* 16, 1432A).

Emperors who were thought by the Fathers to have misused their power were called "tyrants". We have observed this charge made on one occasion or another by almost every one of the Fathers whose attitude towards the Emperor and the imperial office we have considered. The abusive term was applied many times to the anointed of God in the reaction led by Athanasius against according the Emperor, as Eusebius and his contemporaries were apparently prepared to do, such control over the Church as might have proved fatal to her as the mother of all Christians, including the Emperors.

---

[162] *De schismate Donatistarum*, III, 3 (Ziwsa, *CSEL* 62, p. 74).

[163] *Sermo contr. Auxent.*, 36 (*PL* 16, 1061B).

[164] Athanasius, *Apol. contr. Arian.*, 1 (*PG* 25, 248B-249A) and 36 (308D); *Apol. ad Constant. Imp.*, 4 (600D-601A).

[165] *Apol. ad Constant. Imp.*, 9 (*PG* 25, 605BC).

[166] See the letters of the Council of Aquileia to the Emperors; although he was not the president, Ambrose conducted the affairs of the council, and appears to have written the letters: *Ep.* X, 1-2 (*PL* 16, 980C); *Ep.* XII, 5 (989B); *Ep.* XIII, 4 (991B-992A).

[167] Athanasius, *Hist. Arian.*, 52 (*PG* 25, 756C); Ambrose, *Ep.* XXI, 4 (*PL* 16, 1046A).

It was with St. Ambrose, however, that the ecclesiastical defense against imperial efforts to subordinate the Church to the Empire passed into a new phase, and for the first time, so far as I have been able to note, it was the Emperor who deemed it necessary to appear on the defensive. Let us return for a moment to the struggle with Valentinian II on the issue of whether the basilica should be surrendered to the Arian court party. The Emperor believed himself to be within his rights, for imperial sequestration of property belonging to the priesthood of any religion practiced in the Empire was entirely legal.[168] A secretary of Valentinian therefore addressed Ambrose in the Emperor's name, "If you are a tyrant, I want to know it, in order that I may know how to arm myself against you!"[169] Ambrose's reply was that he had done nothing which assumed more for the Church than was proper. "I cannot surrender the basilica," he said, "but I must not fight."[170] If this was tyranny, the Bishop possessed arms, to be sure, but only in Christ's name: the Bishop had the power of offering his body to the Emperor's assault. Why did the Emperor delay to strike if he looked upon the Bishop as a tyrant? By the ancient law (of the Old Testament) priests conferred sovereignty; they did not usurp it, and it was a matter of common knowledge that Emperors had coveted the *sacerdotium,* Ambrose continues, rather than priests the *imperium.* The tyranny of priests was their weakness. Priests had never been tyrants, but they had often suffered from tyrants.[171]

---

[168] *Cf.* Dudden, I (1935), 271-272.

[169] Ambrose, *Ep.* XX, 22 (*PL* 16, 1013A): "Interea nuntiatur mihi missum notarium... Ait, 'Si tyrannus es, scire volo, ut sciam quemadmodum me adversum te praeparem.'"

[170] *Ibid.*, 22 (*PL* 16, 1013AB): "Rettuli dicens me nihil in praeiudicium fecisse ecclesiae... 'Tradere basilicam non possum, sed pugnare non debeo.'"

There was much truth in this last statement. Up to the time of St. Ambrose there is no question but that the Church had fought against imperial tyranny. But no impartial reader of the sources of the struggle between Valentinian II and St. Ambrose, and still more perhaps of the affair of Callinicum, can fail, it would seem to me, to feel that at long length the *sacerdotium* was encroaching upon the *imperium,* and that the Emperor was defending himself against the Bishop. The Emperor lost. The issue at stake in the contest with Valentinian was only apparently whether the Empress Justina should secure a recognized place of worship for her fellow Arians. It had occurred to many churchmen before St. Ambrose to assert the superiority of the Church over the Empire, despite the stand St. Optatus appears to have taken, but in St. Ambrose for the first time in almost four centuries of Christian history the assertion of such an attitude was more than rhetoric.

But not every Bishop had the courage of St. Ambrose. In his *Life of St. Martin,* for example, Sulpicius Severus remarks that in his day it was almost the cardinal virtue for priestly firmness not to have given way to flattery of the Emperor. Sulpicius relates that when many Bishops from various parts of the world had come together to the court of the Emperor Maximus in Gaul, and when the degrading adulation of all around the Emperor was obvious, and the priestly dignity with disgraceful submissiveness had yielded to imperial patronage, in Martin alone did the apostolic authority stand firm and assert itself against the Emperor.[172] It does not matter to our present study whether Sulpicius was very credulous or very insincere; even if his historical trustworthiness has suffered a devastating attack in recent years, his testimony should be of some value.

---

[171] *Ibid.*, 23 (*PL* 16, 1013BC) : "Si haec tyrannidis videntur, habeo arma, sed in Christi nomine: habeo offerendi mei corporis potestatem. Quid moraretur ferire, si tyrannum putaret? Veteri iure a sacerdotibus donata imperia, non usurpata, et vulgo dici quod imperatores sacerdotium magis optaverunt quam imperium sacerdotes . . . Habemus tryannidem nostram. Tyrannis sacerdotis infirmitas est . . . addidi quia numquam sacerdotes tyranni fuerunt, sed tyrannos saepe sunt passi." The references to Migne *PL* 16 are to the edition of 1866 (*cf.* note 1 of this chapter).

St. John Chrysostom's relations with the Byzantine court and his encounters with the Emperor Arcadius and his Empress Eudoxia will be traced in a later chapter. Chrysostom's attitude towards the imperial office will be found not to differ essentially from that of St. Ambrose, although, if anything, he will be seen to attach rather less importance to the office than the latter. Both Chrysostom and Ambrose clung to their convictions with fearless disregard of self. Ambrose succeeded. Chrysostom failed. It does not seem at all fanciful to read in the success of St. Ambrose one of the chief reasons for the great influence of the medieval papacy in the West and to find in the failure of St. John Chrysostom one of the chief causes of that imperial erastianism which remained pretty much a characteristic of the Byzantine Empire until its collapse in the fifteenth century.

[172] *Vita S. Martini,* 20 (Halm, *CSEL* 1, pp. 128-129).

CHAPTER VI

PHILOSOPHY BEFORE THE THRONE

ONE of the most interesting figures in the history of later Greek literature is Synesius of Cyrene. We may consider his famous address *On Kingship* rather as a contrast to than as an example of the patristic attitude towards the Emperor. A Platonic philosopher, who studied under Hypatia of Alexandria and later became Christian Bishop of Ptolemais, Synesius was sent by the citizens of his native Cyrene towards the end of the fourth century to present a golden crown to the Emperor Arcadius, as well as to seek for his city exemption from excessive taxation and relief from the evils of the corrupt military administration of the Pentapolis. After an exasperating delay he was finally able to secure an audience with the Emperor, and his mission proved to have "most beneficial results for the cities of Libya." [1] Synesius tells us that an earthquake cut short his three years stay in Constantinople (397-400 A. D.), and he was unable to bid goodbye to his friend Aurelian, who was then consul.[2] Although the imaginative scholarship of Otto Seeck has introduced a gratuitous problem by challenging the entire chronology (and asserting that Synesius was in Constantinople between the years 399-402),[3] there would seem to be no adequate reason for contesting the year 400 as the date of Synesius's departure from the capital.[4]

---

[1] Synesius, *De insomn.*, 9 (*PG* 66, 1309A).

[2] Synesius, *Ep.* 61 (*PG* 66, 1405A: Hercher, *Epistolographi graeci*, 672); *De insomn.*, 9 (*PG* 66, 1308D); *Hymnus tertius*, 431-432 (*PG* 66, 1600). The earthquake mentioned by Synesius is doubtless the one referred to by St. John Chrysostom, *In acta apostolorum homilia XLI*, 2 (*PG* 60, 291), and *Homilia VII*, 2 (*PG* 60, 66); Chrysostom also observes, *Homilia XLIV*, 4 (*PG* 60, 312), that he was then in his third year of preaching at Constantinople (the year of the earthquake must, therefore, be 400, for he was consecrated Patriarch on February 26, 398). There is no doubt of Aurelian's consulship being in the year 400 (*cf.* Zosimus, *Nova historia*, V, 18, 8: Mendelssohn, p. 237).

[3] Seeck, "Studien zu Synesios," *Philologus*, LII (1894), pp. 458 ff., followed by Georg Grützmacher, *Synesios von Kyrene* (Leipzig, 1913), pp.

Synesius was in Constantinople during a period of no small excitement. Events were stirring of great moment in the eastern half of the Empire, but the Platonist appears to have preserved an academic calm amid the uncertainty and confusion. He has left us a history of the period, one of our few contemporary sources, from which many efforts have been made to reconstruct the story of the years 399-400. The work is an allegory *On Providence,* a mythical episode from the early history of Egypt (λόγος περὶ προνοίας ἢ Αἰγύπτιος).[5] It is well known that Egypt stands for the Roman Empire, Thebes for Constantinople, the Nile for the Bosphorus, and Osiris for Synesius's friend and patron the Praetorian Prefect Aurelian; some of the important characters, however, have never been successfully identified.[6] The evil antagonist of Aurelian in the attempt to attain to the kingship of Egypt, which is to be understood as the praetorian prefecture, is called Typhos by Synesius, but all attempts to discover who Typhos is supposed to be have proved futile.[7] The Emperor is apparently twice mentioned in the allegory as "High Priest" *(hiereus megas),* but for the rest it is important to note that Synesius has written his history as though there were no Emperor.[8]

33-35, and J. B. Bury, *Later Roman Empire from Theodosius to Justinian* (London, 1923), I, p. 128, n. 1.

[4] It is the date accepted by Mommsen, *Historische Schriften,* III (*Gesammelte Schriften,* VI), pp. 295-96.

[5] *PG* 66, 1209-1282.

[6] Seeck, *Phil.* LII (1894), pp. 442-458, has made valiant efforts to identify names and places, but with rather dubious results in several cases.

[7] Seeck, *loc. cit.,* followed by Grützmacher (1913), pp. 47 ff., has endeavored to identify Typhos with Caesarius, who after the assassination of Rufinus in November of 395 became *praefectus praetorio orientis.* Mommsen's last word on the problem was given in his *Historische Schriften,* III, 296, "Wenn Typhos in unserer Präfectenliste sich findet, so ist er allerdings der Caesarius; aber dass er überhaupt darin auftritt, ist mit der Erzählung des Synesius nicht vereinbar."

[8] Seeck (1894), p. 451.

Synesius's allegorical history supplies the indispensable, albeit nebulous, background of his address *On Kingship*, which he assures us he delivered before Arcadius "in a manner bolder than any Greeks before me had ever dared address the Emperor." [9] After such an explicit statement by Synesius himself, no historian has the right, on purely *a priori* bases, to assume that so bold a speech must have been written after the audience with Arcadius.[10] Since we have, further, no means of knowing whether the original address was in any way altered for publication, we must waive the suggestion, for there is little more futile than argument without supporting evidence on either side.

Synesius begins his address with the query whether a man must abase his glance when entering the imperial palace unless he comes with the prestige of a great city and bears with him some majestic message couched in terms of rhetoric and of poetry. He makes the proud suggestion that Philosophy herself has accompanied him into the palace and presence of the Emperor. She has long been absent. Will she be admitted for once and be heard? She will not seek the favor of the great by servile demeanor and wordy adulation. Her words are barbs of truth which she intends should penetrate to the heart. Freedom of speech (λόγος ἐλεύθερος), Arcadius is told, should be highly prized by the Emperor, for truth restrains a young ruler where the too free exercise of his power might be fraught with grave consequences.[11]

Cyrene has sent Synesius "to crown the Emperor's head with gold and his spirit with philosophy." His reference is to the presentation to Arcadius of the *aurum coronarium*. Cyrene in days of yore was "sung in a thousand odes"; now she lies in ruins, and she needs her sovereign.[12] The one who has discovered how the Emperor may be made most virtuous, declares Synesius, is the one who has done most towards re-establishing homes and cities and nations, for all these profit by the fine character of their Emperor.[13] Synesius represents Philosophy herself as ready to pass judgment upon what is worthy and what is unworthy for the benefit of the young Emperor, so that he may embrace the one and reject the other. Arcadius is urged to acquire self-objectivity in the recognition of his failings and in his resolve to correct them.[14]

---

[9] Synesius, *De insomn.* 9 (*PG* 66, 1309A).

[10] This is the allegation of M. Aubé, *Nouvelle biographie générale, sub voce* "Synesius".

[11] Synesius, *De regno,* 1 (*PG* 66, 1053-1056).

[12] *Ibid.,* 2 (*PG* 66, 1056C).

At this point several of the courtiers must have displayed their uneasiness, and appeared to be offended with the directness of Synesius's message to Arcadius.[15] He had warned them, however, that he would be frank, and fore-warned they should have been fore-armed. The court would surely be gratified, he said, to hear him acknowledge what all the world was saying: so great an Empire and such tremendous wealth had never been granted to any one man in the past. The great Darius of legend was at length surpassed. Cities without number made obeisance to an Emperor they had never seen, and whom they could never expect to see, for the sight of the Emperor was beyond their hopes.[16] Synesius would heartily *congratulate* the Emperor on his possession of the Empire (κάλλιστα δὲ ἂν μακαρίσαιμι), but he would certainly not *praise* him on that account (ἐγὼ δὲ ἥκιστα μὲν ἂν ἐντεῦθεν ἐπαινέσαιμι). A man is to be congratulated upon what he possesses outside himself; he is to be praised for what he possesses within himself. The former is the uncertain gift of fortune, the latter the personal prize of character.[17] The young Emperor had need of character and of the protection of God.[18]

---

13 *Ibid.*, 2 (*PG* 66, 1057A).

14 *Ibid.*, 2 (*PG* 66, 1057AB).

15 *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 66, 1057C).

16 *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 66, 1057C).

17 *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 66, 1057-D-1060A).

18 *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 66, 1061A).

The true Emperor *(basileus)* is contrasted with the tyrant *(tyrannos)*.[19] Tyranny is a fearful thing, but it is merely the disease of power, for while law is his conduct for the true Emperor, his own conduct is law for the tyrant. Power they do have in common, but their lives are antagonistic.[20] We have already met with this contrast between the true Emperor and his evil counterpart the tyrant in the Fathers; in the Platonic philosopher Synesius it would have to find a place, for his beloved master had observed, "Tyranny is the most wretched form of government, and the rule of a king the happiest." [21]

The Fathers delighted in the comparison of the Empire on earth with the Empire in heaven. We are not surprised to find Synesius, soon to become Christian Bishop of Ptolemais, instructing the young Arcadius that God wishes everything here on earth to be arranged in imitation of the world above (μίμησις ὑπερκόσμιος): "Beloved, then, of the Great Emperor is the one named after Him, if only he belie not that name." [22]

The ideal Emperor in the opinion of Synesius must be also a philosopher. The Neoplatonists had hailed the Emperor Julian as the Philosopher-King, and Synesius has generally been represented as a Neoplatonist at this stage of his career. When he sketched the ideal prince to Arcadius, Synesius, not yet Christian and always more philosopher than Christian, may have had Julian in mind, although he nowhere mentions the latter in his works, for, failure though he was, the Emperor Julian did possess not a few of the qualifications that Synesius declares requisite to the character of a true sovereign. Julian was famous for his friendships, for example, and Arcadius is urged to place a high value upon friendship.[23] Julian had been a soldier and had lost his life in the almost quixotic incursion into Parthia which Synesius's older contemporary Libanius has immortalized as a great campaign.[24] Synesius tells the young Emperor that he should fraternize with his soldiers: "What could be more shameful than to be an Emperor who is recognized only through the painters by the very men who wage war in his defense?" The Emperor should be "a craftsman of wars, just as the cobbler is a craftsman of shoes."[25]

---

[19] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 66, 1061BC).

[20] *Ibid.*, 3 (*PG* 66, 1064A).

[21] Plato, *Republic*, 576e.

[22] *De regno*, 4 (*PG* 66, 1065C). In chapters 4 and 5 (1065-1068) Synesius presents at considerable length his view of the imperial power as being an "imitation of the world above" (*mimesis hyperkosmios*), which is a view we have met often in the Fathers, most notably in Eusebius, *De laudibus Constantini.*

Synesius rails against the cloistered existence the young Arcadius leads. The majesty of Empire and the fear of becoming a familiar sight and being recognized as mere men have resulted in the Emperors' cloistering themselves, besieging themselves, so that they see and hear precious little of the things by which common sense (*πρακτικὴ φρόνησις*) is acquired. They thus come to enjoy only the most material pleasures of the body. Emperors, they live the life of a mollusc (*βίον ζῶντας ϑαλλατίου πνεύμονος*)! As long as they regard man as unworthy of them, the perfection of man will lie beyond even imperial attainment.[26]

The young Emperor's companions are "men with small heads and petty minds whom nature by some error has stamped amiss, just as dishonest bankers falsify coins." These dullards whose sole skill is buffoonery are aiding the Emperor to pass his leisure in profitless pursuits, and, Synesius tells Arcadius, "encourage by a greater evil that foggy blindness of mind which you have contracted from living a life not in accord with nature."[27] The imperial feet cannot bear to touch a pavement, Synesius adds with scorn, nor earth in its natural state, but gold dust brought from far distant continents must be strewn in the Emperor's path. The Emperors must needs keep to their lair like lizards, not venturing out into the sun, " lest being but men they should be found out as no more by other men." [28]

---

[23] *De regno*, 7-8 (*PG* 66, 1072A-1073A).

[24] Libanius, *Orat.* XVIII, 204-273 (Foerster, II, pp. 325-356).

[25] *De regno*, 9 (*PG* 66, 1073-1076: 1073C, 1076B).

[26] *Ibid.*, 10 (*PG* 66, 1076D-1077A).

[27] *Ibid.*, 10 (*PG* 66, 1077AB).

We have already referred to the critical state in which the eastern half of the Empire found itself in 399-400 A. D., a shadowy account of which is given in Synesius's allegory *On Providence.* The rebel Goths Tribigild and Gainas were in revolt in Anatolia when Synesius delivered his address (autumn of 399 A. D.). We need but mention the names and the influence at this time of Alaric and of Stilicho. Synesius, propagandist of the anti-German party of Aurelian, had had enough of Goths.

Huge and dangerous armies of barbarians, first cousins of their own slaves, declares Synesius, have poured into the Empire. A " national " army of citizen-born troops is advocated. Synesius fears some unholy alliance between barbarians within and without the army and appeals to the Emperor to cleanse the army of " the festering abscess of barbarism " which threatens to destroy them all. Arcadius must enlist in his armies without social distinction every Roman who can serve. Barbarians in the army and in the civil service have been mulcting the people at every opportunity. More barbarians are streaming in, and they take what they want, so to speak, by the persuasiveness of force *(peithanagke)*.[29]

The Emperor is told that he must become a humane collector of taxes, who is willing to cancel some of those inevitable and ubiquitous deficits. Taxes should be commensurate with the ability of those taxed to pay. Synesius denounces business-men to the Emperor with a Platonic reminiscence (*cf. Rep.* 581d) as " the most sordid, the most malicious, the most downright niggardly of all men." [30] The Emperor must realize the importance of choosing as provincial administrators men of vision and of character.[31]

---

[28] *Ibid.*, 11 (*PG* 66, 1080BC).

[29] *Ibid.*, 14-15 (*PG* 66, 1089-1100A).

[30] *Ibid.*, 19 (*PG* 66, 1100D-1101C: 1101B).

[31] *Ibid.*, 21 (*PG* 66, 1104-1105).

The Emperor with the guidance of God ought to become Emperor of himself and within his own soul to establish a monarchy.[32] What is most important for Arcadius, therefore, and most incumbent upon every sovereign, is to establish rule over himself (αὐτὸν ἑαυτοῦ βασιλεύειν), setting the mind to tame the beast that dwells within us all, and not endeavoring to rule over vast numbers of men while he is himself slave to the most shameful mistresses, to pleasure and to pain, and as many beasts related to these as dwell within the breast of man.[33] But one can scarcely forbear to contrast the actual capacity and character, the *arete* of poor Arcadius, with the imperial ideal of Synesius.

It would appear that the oration *On Kingship* was delivered between August and late October or November of 399 A. D. under the protection of Synesius's friend Aurelian while the latter was Praetorian Prefect. Although the orator must have derived in that case no small encouragement from the presence of his powerful friend, his address *On Kingship* is bold and manly, the like of which neither Athanasius nor Hilary of Poitiers, as we have seen, had the courage to deliver in the Sacred Presence.

Once again in this work of Synesius, as so often in the eight centuries before him, the Platonic ideal of kingship has been painted in glowing colors, but in Synesius the picture takes on a somber hue, for shadows were gathering fast in the twilight of the Empire. The address of Synesius differs considerably from the *logoi basilikoi* of his predecessors in this literary *genre,*—Dio Chrysostom, Aelius Aristides, Julian, Libanius, and Themistius. Whereas in the portraits they drew of the ideal Emperor, they hastened to see the exact likenesses of Trajan, Antoninus Pius, Constantius, and Theodosius, Synesius boldly tells the Emperor that if in his address some act of Arcadius's appears as one of those which they both know to be wrong, the Emperor should be angry with himself, not with Synesius, and he should blush, because what has come to the fore is not worthy of an Emperor.[34] The rules for writing imperial encomia, such as those followed by Dio Chrysostom and his successors, are well known to us from Menander Rhetor's manual of epideictic oratory, composed about the middle of the third century A. D.[35] Synesius writes in the tradition. The influence of Dio, whom he especially admired, is everywhere discernible.[36] Synesius says, to be sure, that he will describe the ideal Emperor for Arcadius as if he had set up a statue *(agalma)* of him, " and you shall show me," he continues, " this statue moving and endowed with the breath of life." [37] But Synesius refuses, none the less, to see in Arcadius the realization of a single virtue of the ideal monarch. Therein he boldly departs from the accepted practice of the encomiasts, and only one who has labored through some of the orations of Dio, Julian, and Themistius in praise of the Emperors Trajan, Constantius, and Jovian and Theodosius can appreciate the extent of Synesius's departure. Synesius abounds in advice to the Emperor, the sincerity of which is matched only by the fearlessness with which he offers it. The Emperor should cultivate proper friendships, avoid flattery and absurd pomp, take a personal interest in his army, discard luxury and indolence, meet the Gothic menace immediately, provide for honest provincial administration, mitigate the evils of exhausting taxation, see to the appointment of fit magistrates; he does not hasten then to add, in the manner of Dio, Julian, and Themistius, that these are the duties of the ideal prince, and, of course, Arcadius has discharged them in a princely fashion. These are measures necessary to the survival of the Empire, he believes, and Arcadius has taken no one of them. But there is, we must acknowledge, no little in this address so impractical as to be fantastic. The Emperor, for example, is urged to imitate Agamemnon by knowing the names of his soldiers, at least those of rank, in each corps of infantry and cavalry.[38] Whatever, too, the answer to the Gothic peril, which was real enough, Synesius as spokesman for the anti-German party of Aurelian does not seem to have had it; a wiser, more statesmanlike recognition of the possible service of the Goths to the Empire is to be found in Themistius.[39] But there is a note of optimism pretty much in evidence throughout the address of Synesius; perhaps he entertained the hope that Arcadius would mend his ways, but, if so, the bitter years that lay ahead dispelled that hope, and in its place left the sad desire to delay so long as possible " the end that is inevitable." [40]

---

[32] *Ibid.*, 6 (*PG* 66, 1069A), and *cf. capp.* 3 (1061D) and 22 (1108B).

[33] *Ibid.*, 6 (*PG* 66, 1072A).

---

[34] *De regno*, 2 (*PG* 66, 1057B).

[35] Spengel, *Rhetores graeci*, III (Leipzig, 1856), pp. 368 ff.

[36] The resemblances of Synesius's address *On Kingship* to the four essays of Dio are listed and analyzed in J. R. Asmus, " Synesius und Dio Chrysostomus," *Byzant. Zeitschr.* IX (1900), pp. 91-104. Note also Hans von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa* (Berlin, 1898), pp. 324 ff., 398 ff. The four orations of Dio *On Kingship* are printed in Von Arnim, *Dionis Prusaensis quem vocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia* (2 vols., Berlin, 1893-96), I, pp. 1-77.

[37] *De regno*, 5 (*PG* 66, 1068C).

Not only does the oration of Synesius *On Kingship* differ very much from the productions of those who wrote pagan *logoi basilikoi* before him in his brave reproof of the Emperor, but it differs still more from most of the speeches which the Fathers addressed in the course of the fourth century to their most sacred Emperors. The Fathers recognized the Empire of this world chiefly as an imitation of and a preparation for the Empire that lay beyond. The Athanasians were anxious in their addresses to the Emperor Constantius to separate him from the Arian cause and to enlist him in the service of Catholic orthodoxy. But whereas the subject of Synesius's address is Kingship, the Fathers' chief concern is almost always the Church. The Church Father, however, whom Synesius most closely resembles is St. Ambrose. Both Synesius and St. Ambrose became Bishops, unlike a Hosius of Cordova or an

---

[38] *De regno*, 9 (*PG* 66, 1075D-1076A).

[39] Themistius, *Orat.* XVI (Dindorf, pp. 244-259).

[40] Synesius, *Ep.* 73 (*PG* 66, 1437C).

Athanasius, after mundane careers, the one as a scholar, the other as a statesman.

Synesius's embassy to Arcadius is not entirely unlike the two trips of St. Ambrose on official business to Maximus's court in Gaul. The audacity of Synesius's speech has its parallel in the bold reproach which Ambrose dared to address to Maximus on the occasion of his second embassy to Gaul. As Synesius lectured the young Arcadius on his duties as a sovereign to the State, Ambrose lectured the youthful Valentinian II on his duties as a sovereign to the Church. As the State filled the mind of Synesius, so did the Church fill the mind of St. Ambrose. Synesius would no more think apparently of addressing Arcadius as *aionios basileus* than Ambrose would use *aeternus imperator* of any Emperor but the one in heaven. For both the Neoplatonist and the Christian, God alone was Eternal Emperor after whose kingdom in heaven the earthly Empire was modeled *(mimesis hyperkosmios)*. Neither in Synesius nor in Ambrose is there any trace of that servile adulation of the imperial person and office, so conspicuous in Firmicus and somewhat in evidence in Cyril of Jerusalem. The value to the sovereign of free speech from his subjects is emphasized both by Synesius *(logos eleutheros)* and by St. Ambrose *(libertas dicendi)*, and they would seem to be about equally distinguished in their employment of it. But where Ambrose is the practical statesman and Bishop, Synesius is a scholar keeping company with Homer and Aeschylus, a rather typical Platonist lost in a reverie of Platonic idealities.

But Synesius had a lofty patriotism and a profound respect for the civilizing achievement of Rome; in this regard he followed closely in the best tradition of Aelius Aristides and Libanius of Antioch. The Fathers too were not without some sense of the debt which Christianity owed to the Roman Empire; Eusebius of Caesarea emphasized it at length, and Gregory Nazianzen sometimes made reference to it.

CHAPTER VII

ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

I

Chrysostom and the Imperial Court

One day in late November of 397 A. D. a carriage was to be seen speeding along the post road from Antioch to Pagrae. It was the carriage of Asterius, Count of the East, and by order of the Emperor he had spirited the presbyter John out of Antioch secretly, lest the Antiochenes appreciating their loss should indulge their late propensity for riot. At Pagrae the small company was met by imperial envoys, and then continued with all expedition the two weeks journey to Constantinople where they made a hasty and unpretentious entry. On February 26, 398 A. D. John, late presbyter of the Old Church in Antioch, was consecrated twelfth Bishop and second Patriarch of Constantinople at the unwilling hands of Theophilus of Alexandria. The machinations of the crafty minister Eutropius had secured the selection of John for the office that meant virtual headship of the whole Byzantine episcopate, and the populace of the capital approved the choice with wild enthusiasm.[1] Eutropius wished to employ that eloquence which was to earn its possessor the surname *Chrysostom* in his own behalf and in the service of the State. But while man proposes, God disposes, and the future was destined to be otherwise.

In January of 395 A. D. Theodosius the Great had died at Milan, and three months later (on April 27) his son Arcadius had married Eudoxia, daughter of the Frankish general Bauto, who had been consul in the year 385, the colleague of Arcadius himself when the latter was in his eighth year.[2] The official panegyric, unfortunately no longer extant, in praise of Bauto and the Emperor Valentinian was delivered in their presence by the young rhetorician Augustine of Hippo, who was to become the greatest doctor of the western Church.[3] The historian Philostorgius has described Eudoxia as possessed of "no little of the abandon of the barbarians." [4] The history of Chrysostom's six years as Bishop of Constantinople is inextricably associated with the character and the actions of the Empress Eudoxia. The sermons wherein he makes his greatest obeisance to imperial power, as well as those in which the barbs of his invective cut the deepest, are sermons which she inspired. The meeting of Chrysostom and Eudoxia proved to be fatal to each of them: she died six years after it in terrified childbirth, and men said that God had punished the superstitious Empress for her merciless antagonism to Chrysostom,[5] while he himself followed her to the grave three years later in a place more deserted than "the most deserted spot in all the world" [6] because the power of the Empress had been too much for a Bishop to resist.

---

[1] Palladius, *Dialogus de vita S. Ioannis Chrysostomi,* 5 (*PG* 47, 19); Socrates, VI, 2 (*PG* 67, 661-664); Sozomen, VIII, 2 (*PG* 67, 1517). *Cf.* Chr. Baur, *Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit* (Munich), II (1930), pp. 12-20.

In the early months of their acquaintance the relations of Chrysostom and Eudoxia were harmonious. She interested herself in the religious processions that he organized in order to combat the strong Arian influence in the city; she attended his sermons and presented silver candlestick-crosses for the use of the nocturnal congregations which he was wont from time to time to assemble. She was his constant partner in the attempt to elevate the religious life of a dissolute city. On one famous occasion she took part in an impressive nightly procession. The relics of the martyr Phocas had been brought from Pontus to Constantinople, and on the following day the Em-

[2] Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, I, 244; II, 61.

[3] Augustine, *Conf.*, VI, 6; *Contr. litter. Petil.*, III, 25, 30.

[4] Philostorgius, XI, 6 (*PG* 65, 600B: Bidez, *GCS* 21, p. 136).

[5] Seeck, *PW* VI (1909), 925.

[6] Chrysostom, *Ep.* 234 (*PG* 52, 739).

peror and Empress were present at the celebration of the relics' reception into the city, " for such is the power of the martyrs that not only persons in a private station but even those who wear the diadems of Empire cannot withstand it." [7] More solemn by far, however, was the translation of the relics together with those of some unknown martyrs from Santa Sophia, where they had first been placed, to the martyry of St. Thomas on the sea-shore at Drypia, which was some nine miles from the city. Then it was that Eudoxia herself appeared in the cathedral, and thence with her own hands bore the relics through the city, and accompanied them all the way to Drypia. The glare of flaming torches lit the faces of thousands as they moved through the night, an Empress in their midst, while the grandeur of the scene made a profound impression upon Chrysostom. When they arrived at Drypia, he addressed the great throng, and we may well imagine that his eyes fell again and again upon the Empress as he spoke.[8]

" What shall I say? of what shall I speak? I leap up and am beside myself: 'tis a madness that surpasses wisdom. I fly and dance and feel myself up-lifted and I am drunk with spiritual joy. What shall I say? of what shall I speak? Of the power of the martyrs? of the devotion of the city? of the fervor of an Empress?" Women softer than wax had vied with strong men in their eagerness to make the long journey on foot; the magistrates of the city *(archontes)* had even left behind their carriages, as well as their lictors and attendants, and they were mingling with the common people. But why mention women and magistrates when she who wore the diadem and was clad in purple did not suffer herself to be separated from the relics for a moment along the entire way? Like a maid-servant *(therapainis)* she followed the saints, holding on to the casket and the linen cloth that lay upon it, trampling under foot all human pride *(typhos)*, and in the midst of this spectacle she was seen by her people. The eunuchs in the imperial palace did not as a whole enjoy the right *(themis)* to look upon the Empress. But the latter's yearning for the martyrs and the tyranny of love that burned within her prevailed upon her to cast off the mask *(prosopeia)* of imperial seclusion and to reveal in naked earnestness her devotion to the holy martyrs. The Christ-loving *(philochristos)* Empress followed the relics, touching them frequently and drawing upon herself their blessing; it was she who taught all the rest to share in the beauty of this spiritual commerce *(emporia)* and to draw from that source that ever flows and never is exhausted.[9]

---

[7] Chrysostom, *De S. hieromartyre Phoca,* 1 (*PG* 50, 699).

[8] *Hom. II post translationem reliquiarum martyrum habita* (*PG* 63, 467-472). The torches are described in col. 470; Chrysostom addresses Eudoxia directly in col. 472.

They could look up into the heavens and behold the moon and the stars in the midst of the firmament; below was the multitude of the faithful, and the Empress moving in their midst was more radiant than the moon, " for just as the stars that are lower are clearer than those that are higher, so too is she much brighter than the moon on high." Chrysostom inquired of the assembled throng what was most admirable in this Empress, whose fervor burned more ardently than fire, whose faith was more solid than adamant. Her modesty and humility put all others in the shade. She had laid aside the marks of her imperial rank, the diadem, the robes of purple, the arrogance that comes with Empire, and the very queenship. Humility was her garb, and her appearance thereby the more radiant. There had been many Empresses before her who had shared in the raiment, diadem, and glory of imperial power (ἡ δόξα ἡ βασιλική) : for Eudoxia alone, however, had the imperial estate constituted a true embellishment *(kosmos)* and a token of real victory *(tropaion)*. Witness her love and respect for the martyrs, her dismissal of her bodyguard, and her mingling with the crowd, so that she could scarcely be distinguished from her people. She did the people as much good as the martyrs! She had followed the relics the whole nine miles, never tiring, never hesitating. Chrysostom and the people would never cease blessing her, and not only they but all future generations would do the same. The civilized world and all the earth beheld by the sun would hear of that glorious night and of that glorious Empress.[10]

---

[9] *Hom. II*, 1 (*PG* 63, 469).

"The gladness of this festival," Chrysostom told the Empress, "lacks but the presence of the Emperor most beloved of God, who draws with you the plow of piety." [11] The Emperor had been held back that day, however, by the prudence of the Empress, so that a numerous mounted guard and soldiers should not injure virgins, old women, and old men, and encroach upon their holiday. But Eudoxia had promised that he should appear the next day, and the service would again be held in the Emperor's presence. Their joy was to be prolonged another day. Eudoxia must needs have the Emperor come, "for just as she shares the imperial power with him, so also does she share piety, and she does not allow him to be without a share in things well done, but receives him everywhere as her partner." [12] This day they had seen the Christ-loving Empress with the city about her; on the day following they were to see the Emperor beloved of God with his army. Chrysostom closes with a prayer to the holy martyrs to grant the imperial couple a long life, a flourishing old age, children, and grandchildren—but above all these he prays that their zeal may increase, their piety grow, and that they may depart this present life to rule through all eternity with the only begotten Son of God.[13]

The next day the Emperor came to Drypia with the city garrison *(stratopedon),* and once more Chrysostom spoke to the assembled people. He praised the Emperor as one who was in a position to confer benefits on all men throughout the world and yet had that day through love and piety come himself to receive benefits from the holy martyrs.[14] He found slight occasion, however, for an imperial panegyric. The Emperor and his guard had merely made their appearance and forthwith departed. Chrysostom finished his address with a discussion of the sinful fall of Adam, man's great hope of heaven, the murder of Abel, and the resurrection of the dead.[15]

---

[10] *Hom. II,* 2 (*PG* 63, 470-471).

[11] *Hom. II,* 3 (*PG* 63, 472).

[12] *Hom.* II, 3 (*PG* 63, 472).

[13] *Hom. II,* 3 (*PG* 63, 472).

Chrysostom harbored none of the illusions of the semi-divine nature of the imperial office that we observed in Eusebius of Caesarea, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Optatus of Milevis. It is true that the nightly procession to Drypia, nine miles of hymn-singing in the motley of languages that was the Empire of the East,[16] the great devotion of the Empress could evoke from Chrysostom extravagant praise of the latter and her imperial husband. It was but a rhapsody at dawn. His devotion to the best interests of the Church and his uncompromising adherence to the social gospel that he preached made it impossible for him to emulate the courtier. His favor at court did not last long. The time was not far distant indeed when he was to recall with perplexity and searchings of heart the extravagant assertions of Eudoxia's "modesty and humility" (ἡ συντριβὴ τῆς διανοίας καὶ ἡ ταπεινοφροσύνη)[17] that he had made so confidently in the sermon at Drypia.

It must have been something over a year later, early in 401 A. D., that Eudoxia unjustly deprived the widow of a certain Theognostus of her vineyard.[18] Chrysostom interceded in the widow's behalf and thereby offended the Empress. When Porphyrius, Bishop of Gaza, therefore, came to Constantinople in the spring of 401 A. D., seeking to avail himself of Chrysostom's influence with the Emperor (Porphyrius wished the government to suppress paganism in his diocese), Chrysostom had to tell him, " I cannot take up the matter with the Emperor, for the Empress has roused his indignation against me, because I charged her with the robbery of property she had coveted." [19]

---

[14] *Hom. III*, 1 (*PG* 63, 473).

[15] *Ibid.*, 1-4 (*PG* 63, 473-478).

[16] Chrysostom was deeply interested in the many peoples and languages in the service of God and the social unity they were able to achieve under the Emperor. In *Hom. II post trans. reliqu. mart.*, 3 (*PG* 63, 472), he tells Eudoxia before the throng at Drypia, "You have led forth for us countless choirs (*choroi*) that chant the psalms of David in Latin, in Syrian, in Gothic, and in Greek. We have seen, too, diverse peoples and diverse choirs all having but a single harp, that of David, and crowning you with their prayers."

[17] *Hom. II post trans. reliqu. mart.*, 2 (*PG* 63, 470).

[18] Chrysostom, *Ep. ad Imperatricem Eudoxiam* (*Suppl. ad epp.*, *PG* 64, 493, 496). *Cf.* Pseudo-Georgius Alexandrinus, *Vita Chrysostomi*, 40 (in *Opera omnia Chrysostomi*, Savile, VIII, pp. 216-217).

Chrysostom denounced the social injustice and the economic inequalities of his time,[20] and his heart went out to the urban poor, who loved him for his generosity. His scathing remarks on the ridiculous airs and extravagant finery of court ladies like Marsa, Castricia, and Eugraphia led to a court amalgam against him.[21] He of all men was least competent to cope with the intricacies of boudoir politics. His heroism in offering the asylum of the Church to the fallen minister Eutropius (late July or early August of 399 A. D.) and his fearless opposition to the Gothic leader Gainas during the latter's virtual occupation of the capital for more than six months (apparently from December of 399 to July of 400 A. D.) greatly enhanced his prestige. But the Patriarch's courage earned him also the jealous reprobation of the court clique which came to have the Empress at its head. To this association of petty minds and self-seeking cabalists were added various churchmen who found the pleasures of Constantinople more attractive than the duties of their sometimes remote dioceses. Such men were Severian of Gabala, Antiochus of Ptolemais, and Acacius of Beroea, whose enmity to Chrysostom was to do much to encompass his ruin.[22] More formidable, however, was the hatred of Theophilus, Patri-

[19] Marcus Diaconus, *Vita S. Porphyrii Gazensis*, V (37) (*PG* 65, 1229).

[20] Palladius, *Dialogus de vita S. Ioannis Chrysostomi*, 5 (*PG* 47, 20). The edition of the Greek text of Palladius by P. R. Coleman-Norton (Cambridge, 1928) gives parallel references to Migne, which is the only text of Palladius cited in this study.

[21] Palladius, *Dialogus*, 4 (*PG* 47, 16), 6 (21), 8 (27), *et passim*.

[22] Socrates, VI, 11 (*PG* 67, 696-700); Sozomen, VIII, 10 (*PG* 67, 1541-1544); Palladius, *Dial.*, 4 (*PG* 47, 16), 6 (21), *et passim*.

arch of Alexandria, for the latter's gift for under-handed intrigue made him more than a match for Chrysostom.[23]

Early in 403 A. D. Epiphanius of Constantia (Salamis in Cyprus) came to Constantinople at the insistence of Theophilus to support the latter in his persecution of the "Tall Brothers" of Nitria (in upper Egypt). The Nitrian monks, whom Theophilus charged with being Origenists, had sought refuge in the capital and had succeeded in enlisting in their own behalf the active support of the Empress.[24] After a bewildered four months Epiphanius perceived that he had been misled by Theophilus (the Nitrian monks were not heretics after all) and set sail in early May for Cyprus.[25] During his residence in Constantinople Epiphanius acquired an intense dislike of Chrysostom, which the latter heartily reciprocated; the Empress, however, showed great deference to the aged Bishop and asked him on one occasion to pray for the infant Theodosius who was ill.[26] Chrysostom interpreted such attention to Epiphanius as an affront to himself, and no sooner had Epiphanius departed than Chrysostom delivered a discourse, no longer extant, on the vices of women. The attack upon women in general was understood (and perhaps rightly) [27] to be an attack upon Eudoxia in particular. She bitterly resented the Patriarch's attitude and complained to Arcadius that "the insult offered to her was equally an insult to him." [28]

---

[23] Palladius, *Dial., passim*, but particularly the summary of Chrysostom's letter to Innocent I which is given in *cap.* 2 (*PG* 47, 8-12). See also Baur, II (1930), and H. G. Opitz, "Theophilos," *PW* V (2te Reihe, 1934), 2149-2165, and especially cols. 2152: 20 to 2158: 40, where Opitz gives an outline of the relations of Theophilus and Chrysostom with the more important references to the sources. Opitz is more than commonly sympathetic to Theophilus.

[24] Sozomen, VIII, 13 (*PG* 67, 1549C).

[25] *Acta sanctorum*, May 12 (III, pp. 44F-46F). Epiphanius died on the homeward voyage. *Cf.* the Greek menology excerpt in *PG* 41, 21.

[26] Sozomen, VIII, 15 (*PG* 67, 1553D-1556A).

[27] Sozomen, VIII, 16 (*PG* 67, 1557AB), acknowledges frankly, "I am not able to state with certainty whether it was by chance that John was led to speak as he did or whether, as certain persons allege, the reason was that he suspected the Empress of having persuaded Epiphanius to plot against him."

Imperial majesty had been reviled, and when Chrysostom delivered a sermon on the wretchedness of the imperial household, it became apparent that he had gone too far. The Emperor lived a life of anxiety and tribulation, he told the people, and it was not his diadem that they should pay heed to, but to the sea of troubles which ever threatened to engulf him. "Consider not his purple robe, but his soul which is darker than purple." [29] The crown did not so closely encircle his brow as care gripped his heart, "for you cannot find a private house laden with so much misery as the imperial palace." Violent deaths were daily expected, and blood was seen whenever the imperial household sat down to eat or drink. Who could say what visions haunted the Emperor at night? What could be more pitiable than such a life? The pavement of the imperial palace always ran with blood, the blood of the imperial family. Had not the present Emperor from the time he received the diadem passed his life in toil and danger, grief and dejection, misfortune and conspiracy? [30]

Chrysostom's indiscretions mounted, and he seems not to have appreciated how precarious his position had become. At this time, June of 403 A. D., Chrysostom's implacable enemy Theophilus of Alexandria arrived in Constantinople, attended by a large retinue of Egyptian Bishops, to answer before a synod under the presidency of Chrysostom the charges which the Nitrian monks now preferred against their persecutor. Chrysostom became suddenly anxious to conciliate Theophilus, however, and he determined not to interfere in the affairs of a province that lay without his jurisdiction.[31] But Eudoxia had made the cause of the Nitrian monks her own, and she was extremely provoked at Chrysostom's stand (he had not been so scrupulous at Ephesus two years before!). She made no secret of her decision to employ against Chrysostom the synod which had assembled to investigate the conduct of Theophilus.[32]

---

[28] Socrates, VI, 15 (*PG* 67, 708); Sozomen, VIII, 16 (*PG* 67, 1557).

[29] *Hom. XV in ep. ad Philipp.*, 5 (*PG* 62, 294).

[30] *Hom. XV*, 5 (*PG* 62, 295).

[31] Seeck, *Untergang*, V (1913), pp. 358-359.

The Synod of the Oak was convened in a suburb of Chalcedon in late June or early July of 403. Theophilus, who much preferred to work with the Empress than have her against him, spent an energetic three weeks in consolidating the opposition to Chrysostom, who was summoned to face a packed assembly. The Emperor had authorized the process against him, but like Athanasius at the Council of Tyre Chrysostom refused to be judged by his enemies, and failing to present himself before the synod he was deposed for contumacy.[33] Crowds began to gather around the episcopal palace and the cathedral to protect Chrysostom while he met a situation that required tact and adroit maneuvering with nothing more than fluent invective. The day after his deposition he preached two highly excited sermons in which he pilloried the Emperor and the Empress with biblical comparisons of no particular subtlety.[34]

Come what may, he is not to be intimidated. Death or exile holds no terror for him.[35] " But you know, my beloved," he tells the loyal congregation, " why they wish to depose me—because I have not decked out my house in tapestries, because I have not clothed myself in silken garments, and because I have no heart for their gluttony. The adder has been hatched and has thriven. The seed of Jezebel still survives among us!"[36] He tells them that once more Herodias demands the head of John.[37] David was a King and lived in a royal palace, but his view of the kingship did not include "plunder and the destruction of piety, an anxious regard for treasure, and the necessity of a woman's consent." David was a soldier.[38] We can easily imagine the thrill that must have gone through his audience. He was speaking of the Emperor.

---

[32] Socrates, VI, 15 (*PG* 67, 708B); Sozomen, VIII, 16 (*PG* 67, 1557A); Zosimus, V, 23, 3 (Mendelssohn, p. 244).

[33] Palladius, *Dial.*, 8 (*PG* 47, 25-30); Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 59 (*PG* 103, 105-113). *Cf.* Baur, II (1930), pp. 202-222.

[34] The texts of two sermons are extant (*PG* 52, 427-432; 435-438). Seeck, *PW* VI, 921, believes that they are merely stenographic redactions of a single sermon, neither of which is from the pen of Chrysostom, but that they were written out afterwards from memory by two of his auditors. Lietzmann, *PW* IX, 1822, however, observes, "einfache Stenogrammdublette kann sie schwerlich sein;" he suggests that the second sermon was probably delivered on the same day as the first, but before a different audience. Lietzmann would seem to be right. The sermons are too different to be merely two stenographic variants of the same discourse.

[35] *Hom. ante exsilium habita*, 1 (*PG* 52, 427). *Cf. Hom. altera*, 1 (*PG* 52, 435).

Chrysostom apparently addressed a different group later the same day. Excitement was running high in the capital, and thousands had rallied to his support. "My brothers, can it be that we wish to malign the Empress?" he asked; "but what *can* I say? Jezebel creates a tumult and Elijah flees! Herodias rejoices and John is put in fetters!" He worked himself up into a frenzy and cried, "Last night she called me the thirteenth apostle, and today her name for me is Judas! Yesterday she sat willingly by my side, and today like a wild beast she has attacked me!" What had she been plotting, this lawless and hateful woman, this new Jezebel?"[39]

The synodical decree of deposition was followed by an imperial rescript banishing the Patriarch; the charge was high treason *(kathosiosis):* he had called the Empress Jezebel.[40] Three days after the Emperor's declaration, to forestall an insurrection in his behalf, John surrendered himself to the imperial officers and withdrew to Praenetus in Bithynia. The populace became tumultuous. The Emperor and Empress were reviled for their betrayal of the Patriarch. Afraid to face the mounting indignation of the people and alarmed at some misfortune *(thrausis)* which occurred in the imperial bed-chamber (possibly the sudden death of their daughter Flaccilla)

---

[36] *Hom. ante exsil.*, 4 (*PG* 52, 431). *Cf. Hom. altera*, 1 (*PG* 52, 435).

[37] *Hom. ante exsil.*, 4 (*PG* 52, 432). *Cf. Hom. altera*, 2 (*PG* 52, 437).

[38] *Hom. ante exsil.*, 5 (*PG* 52, 432).

[39] *Hom. altera*, 2 (*PG* 52, 437-438).

[40] Palladius, *Dial.*, 8 (*PG* 47, 30).

Arcadius and Eudoxia hastily consented to Chrysostom's recall.[41]

The eunuch Briso was immediately dispatched to effect Chrysostom's return. He was the bearer of a letter from the Empress to the Patriarch, in which she begged his Holiness (ἡ ἁγιωσύνη) not to suppose that she had been aware of what was taking place. She was innocent of his blood. Wicked and corrupt men had devised the plot, and God whom she served was a witness to her tears. She well remembered that her children had been baptized at his hands. "We have lost the priest," she had told her imperial husband, clinging to his knees; "but let us bring him back." [42] John re-crossed the Bosphorus, and the excited populace prevailed upon him to disregard canonical sanction and without revocation of the sentence of deposition standing against him to re-occupy the cathedra.[43] He preached to an eager multitude in the Church of the Apostles.[44]

"I gave thanks when I was expelled, I give thanks when I return." The stratagems of his enemies had heightened the affections of his people. Games were being held in the circus that day, but there was no one present at them. He found the prayers of his flock, he told them, more glorious than a diadem. The wickedness of his enemies had not been able to withstand the glory of his return. His enemies had retired in confusion.

---

[41] Palladius, *Dial.*, 9 (*PG* 47, 30); Socrates, VI, 16 (*PG* 67, 712C-713A); Sozomen, VIII, 18 (*PG* 67, 1561D-1564A).

[42] *Hom. post reditum a priore exsilio*, 4 (*PG* 52, 445-446).

[43] Socrates, VI, 16 (*PG* 67, 713AB), and Sozomen, VIII, 18 (*PG* 67, 1564AB), both note that Chrysostom unwillingly resumed the episcopal office. He wished first to have the sentence of the Synod of the Oak abrogated by a larger assembly. The fourth and twelfth canons of the Council of Antioch (341 A. D.) provided that a Bishop deposed by one synod could not re-enter his see without being re-instated by a larger synod, and he was forbidden to appeal to the Emperor; violators of these canons were to be forever dispossessed of their sees (Mansi, *SS. conc. coll.*, II, 1309, 1313).

[44] The original is not known to be extant, but there are two Latin translations, stenographic variants of the address delivered by Chrysostom (*PG* 52, 439-442). The first copy contains the words "Imperatores nobiscum, principes nobiscum" (col. 441), which are lacking in the second copy.

"The Emperor and the Empress are with us; the city magistrates are with us." He closed the brief address with reiterated thanks to God.[45]

On the following Sunday Chrysostom is believed to have delivered the discourse which has been preserved at the end of the *Vita Chrysostomi* of the Pseudo-George of Alexandria (about 680-725 A. D.).[46] Doubt has recently been cast on its authenticity, at least in its present form,[47] although a sermon very similar in content and spirit was known to the historian Sozomen (about 439-450 A. D.).[48] The reasons for rejecting it are inadequate, and its genuineness is well attested among modern authorities.[49]

---

[45] *Sermo post reditum a priore exsilio*, 1-2 (*PG* 52, 439-442).

[46] Savile, *Op. omn. Chrysos.*, VIII, pp. 262-265: *PG* 52, 443-448.

[47] Baur, II (1930), p. 227, n. 15; p. 230, n. 27. Baur rejects the discourse chiefly on the grounds that such a complete *volte face* on Eudoxia's part is inconceivable, and like Montfaucon, *Monitum* in *PG* 52, 437-438, he believes that the passage reproaching Theophilus of Alexandria for violation of the church by forcible entry with armed soldiers (*PG* 52, 444), since it contains mention of the baptismal font's being filled with blood, can refer only to events preceding Chrysostom's second exile in June of 404 A. D. But the troublesome phrase looks like an insertion inspired by accounts of the "bloody Easter" of the year 404. In any event the section in praise of Arcadius, as opposed to the aggressor whom Chrysostom is denouncing (*βασιλεὺς εἰσέρχεται καὶ ῥίπτει ἀσπίδα καὶ διάδημα· σὺ εἰσῆλθες καὶ ῥόπαλα ἥρπασας. Ἐκεῖνος καὶ τὰ συνθήματα τῆς βασιλείας ἔξω ἀφίησι· σὺ τὰ συνθήματα τοῦ πολέμου ἐνταῦθα εἰσήνεγκας*), which is inseparably a part of the passage in dispute, can scarcely be fitted into any other circumstances than those under which the discourse purports to have been delivered (immediately after the first exile in 403 A .D.). After events which culminated in his second exile Chrysostom had no occasion to speak of Arcadius in tones of deference as one who "enters the church and lays aside his shield and diadem... and leaves outside the church the symbols of imperial power." The relations of Eudoxia and Chrysostom as revealed in this discourse, moreover, are completely in accord with the account in the historian Sozomen (VIII, 18).

[48] Sozomen, VIII, 18 (*PG* 67, 1564 B). Baur, II (1930), p. 227, n. 15, asserts, however, "Hier hat aber Sozomenus wohl nur gedichtet." But Sozomen is not given to writing fiction, as Baur elsewhere acknowledges (I, p. XVII).

[49] Stilting, *Acta sanctorum*, September 14 (IV, p. 589, sec. 952), accepts the discourse as unquestionably genuine, and approves of it very highly

When the Egyptian Pharaoh took the beautiful Sarah from her husband Abraham and attempted to seduce her, Chrysostom told the congregation in this sermon, there had been foreshadowed the effort of another Egyptian (Theophilus of Alexandria) to seduce the Church of Constantinople. But just as the chastity of Sarah had withstood the desires of Pharaoh, so had the Church in her experience of the past several days emerged unscathed and chastened by the victory over her would-be seducer. Like the spouse of Abraham the Church to which Chrysostom was wedded had proved itself alone, " for if I had been with you, I should have had to share your victory." The shepherd had realized before what wealth he possessed in the flock, but now the loyalty of his flock left him lost in admiration. The whole sermon throbs with the warm gratitude of a man whose capacity for love was very great: " The agora has become a church! " he told his people, adding in wonder, " All this for me! "

The Empress had chimed in with the cry for his return, and the people had accepted her as their leader (*βασιλίδα συγχορεύουσαν ἐλάβετε*). He could not pass over her anxiety for his return, and he did not speak of her to flatter her. He wished but to honor her piety. She had not aided his return by taking up arms—she could not do that—but she had intervened in his behalf with the strength of righteous courage (*κατορθώματα ἀρετῆς*).

" I will tell you a secret . . . I sat alone, worried about you, and alone I had to consider what my life in a foreign land might be. Suddenly in that midnight of my hopes this

(" Homilia illa, de qua loquitur Sozomenus, illa ipsa est, quam frequenter iam laudavimus.") Tillemont, *Mémoires*, XI (1706), p. 600, n. 73, is also unable to doubt its genuineness, and he believes it to be quite characteristic of Chrysostom (" Mais il a ce me semble tout l'air de S. Chrysostome, et s'accorda fort bien avec ce que nous trouvons ailleurs sur son retour."), whereas Baur, II (1930), p. 230, n. 27, feels, " Indes stimmt die Sprache und die ganze Haltung der Rede nicht zu Chrysostomus." It is interesting, to say the least, that two such great Chrysostomists as Tillemont and Baur should have come from this sermon with exactly opposite conclusions.

Empress most beloved of God sent me a message." She disclaimed all responsibility for the misfortune that had befallen him, and recalled that her children had been baptized at his hands.[50]

She was a priestess self-ordained (*ἡ ἱέρεια αὐτοχειροτόνητος*). What Chrysostom found most admirable about the Empress, however, was that while envious priests neither knew nor cared whither he had gone, the Empress as though concerned for a child had searched for him everywhere, not in person, of course, but by the soldiers she had sent to find him.

"You know with what kindness she received me, how she embraced me as though I were a member of her own family, and how she said that she had been earnestly working with you. Those words did not escape your own kindness of heart, because you received the mother of churches, the nurse of monks, the patroness of saints, the staff of the poor. Praise of her becomes a glory to God, an honor for churches. Shall I speak of her burning love? Shall I mention her great regard for me? Late last night she sent me this message: 'Tell him my prayer has been fulfilled. The success I have achieved is a crown more worthy than the diadem of Empire. I have recovered the priest, restored the head to the body, the pilot to the ship, the shepherd to the flock, the bridegroom to the marriage chamber.' " He assured his listeners that in the future he and they would work together, and he further declared that he would always work in agreement with the Augusta most beloved of God.[51] He roused the congregation to such a pitch of excitement that they applauded wildly, for Eudoxia appears to have been very popular with them, and Chrysostom was unable to finish the elaborate sermon he had prepared.[52]

After having referred to the Empress as Jezebel, Herodias, a wild beast, this seems like an amazing about-face on Chrysostom's part. But it would be useless to seek any other explanation than the fact that Chrysostom was highly emotional and deviated easily into superlatives. He was describing the Empress, it would appear, in terms of virtues which he hoped she might come to possess rather than virtues which he believed she had acquired over night.

---

[50] *Hom. post red. a priore exsil.*, 4 (*PG* 52, 445).

[51] *Ibid.*, 1-5 (*PG* 52, 443-448).

[52] Sozomen, VIII, 18 (*PG* 67, 1564B).

Peace between the Empress and the Patriarch was short-lived, however, and two months after Chrysostom had assured his congregation of an enduring harmony between them, an incident occurred that was to cause the final rupture. The Prefect of the City, Simplicius, *vir clarissimus,* anxious to gain favor at court had sought and had obtained the permission of Arcadius to erect a silver statue of Eudoxia upon the rostra at the place called *Pittakia*[53] in the center of the Augusteum (just south of the vestibule of Santa Sophia). The statue of the Empress clad in the long imperial mantle was mounted on a tall column of porphyry, which was set in a marble stylobate still preserved with its dedicatory inscriptions.[54] The statue was dedicated in late September or early November of 403.[55] It was an honor properly to be reserved for an Emperor.

---

[53] See Du Cange, *Constantinopolis christiana* (Paris, 1680), bk. IV, p. 177.

[54] The inscription, *CIL*, III, no. 736, was discovered in 1848 and is now preserved in the Turkish Arms Museum (*Silâh Müzesi*) in the ancient Church of St. Irene in Istamboul. On one side of the marble base is the Latin dedication:

D(ominae) N(ostrae) AEL(iae) EVDOXIAE SEMPER AUGUSTAE
V(ir) C(larissimus) SIMPLICIUS PRAEF(ectus) URB(i) DEDICAVIT

On the other side are four hexameter verses:

[κίο]να πορφυρέην καὶ ἀργυρέην βασίλειαν
δέρκεο, ἔνθα πόληι θεμιστεύουσιν ἄνακτες.
οὔνομα δ' εἰ ποθέεις, Εὐδόξια, τίς δ'ἀνέθηκεν;
Σιμπλίκιος, μεγάλων ὑπάτων γόνος, ἐσθλὸς ὕπαρχος.

[55] Prosper of Aquitaine, *Chron., ad annum* 403 (*PL* 51, 589: Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, I, 499); Marcellinus Comes, *Chron., ad annum* 403 (*PL* 51, 922: Mommsen, *Chron. min.*, II, 67). The details of the dedication of the statue and Chrysostom's part in the episode are to be found in Socrates, VI, 18 (*PG* 67, 716C-717A), Sozomen, VIII, 20 (*PG* 67, 1568AB), and Nicephorus Callistus, XIII, 18 (*PG* 146, 992C-993A).

The solemn rites of dedication and of imperial acceptance were considerably enlivened by boisterous merrymaking, and the mimes, dances, and games such as were customarily held at the unveiling of an Emperor's statue interrupted on this occasion the services in the cathedral nearby. The service could scarcely be heard above the din. Chrysostom was deeply offended by the frivolous character of the ceremonies, heritage of a pagan past, and in a public discourse he ridiculed the participants in the celebration, lamenting the ignominy they had brought upon the Church.[56]

Eudoxia was immediately informed of this apparent hostility, and once more she resolved to use against Chrysostom a church council which he had himself been instrumental in summoning. After his return from exile more than sixty Bishops had held communion with him, and although he had regarded this fact as constituting canonical approval of his re-occupation of the see, he was anxious nevertheless that the shade of illegality should be entirely removed from his path.[57] Eudoxia had determined, however, that the assembled clerics should confirm, and not nullify, the condemnation of Chrysostom by the Synod of the Oak. Chrysostom's enemies, Severian of Gabala, Acacius of Beroea, and Antiochus of Ptolemais, suddenly appeared in the capital, and court ladies and fashionable clerics aided them in planning an offensive that should prove the undoing of Chrysostom. When the Patriarch learned of this turn of events, he lost his temper completely, and in a discourse that was famous throughout the fifth century he attacked the Empress with ample reference to Scripture.[58]

" Again Herodias raves, again she is troubled, again she dances, again in her wickedness she desires Herod to cut off the head of John the Baptist! Jezebel seeks to rob Naboth of his vineyard, and to pursue the holy Elijah into the hills!"[59] So much of the sermon that has come down to us is genuine. The rest has been largely adapted from a Syriac sermon of St. Ephraim of Edessa.[60] The speaker knows that there are many good and virtuous women, a review of whose lives would be edifying, and would incite to a love of what is good, but "there is no wild beast in all creation comparable to an evil woman."[61] Eudoxia is nowhere mentioned by name, but if Chrysostom delivered such an address, there could have been no one in his audience who failed to hear the name he did not utter.[62]

---

[56] Socrates, VI, 18 (*PG* 67, 717A) ; Sozomen, VIII, 20 (*PG* 67, 1568AB) ; Nicephorus Callistus, XIII, 18 (*PG* 146, 992D).

[57] Socrates, VI, 18 (*PG* 67, 717C) ; Sozomen, VIII, 20 (*PG* 67, 1568C).

[58] Socrates, VI, 18 (*PG* 67, 717B) ; Sozomen, VIII, 20 (*PG* 67, 1568B) ; Nicephorus Callistus, XIII, 18 (*PG* 146, 993A).

The Empress and the factions hostile to Chrysostom summoned Theophilus of Alexandria to the capital; they had great confidence in this man, "for Theophilus was naturally an impetuous person, headstrong, bold, and extraordinarily fond of quarrelling." But Theophilus was unwilling to take the risk of another appearance in Constantinople; the year before, he had quit the city in great haste while an excited populace searched for him in order to drown him.[63] The Empress had on that occasion proved an ally of very doubtful dependability. In his stead he sent three "miserable" Bishops, instructing them to use the fourth and more especially the twelfth canon of the Arian Council of Antioch, for the former canon Chrysostom had violated in returning to the cathedral without readmittance through a synod of Bishops larger than that which had expelled him, and the latter canon he had violated in appealing from the Synod of the Oak to the authority of the Emperor.

---

[59] *Hom. in decoll. praecurs. et Bapt. Ioann. et in Herodiad.*, 1 (*PG* 59, 485). It was, however, not Herodias who danced but Salome.

[60] "Adversus improbas mulieres," *Sancti Ephraem Syri opera omnia . . .* interprete et scholiaste . . . Gerardo Vossio (3 ed., Cologne, 1616), I, pp. 120-123.

[61] *Hom. in decoll.*, 1 (*PG* 59, 486).

[62] The first great editor of Chrysostom, Sir Henry Savile, rejected the discourse as spurious in the early seventeenth century (*Op. omn. Chrysos.*, VIII, p. 869). Montfaucon towards the end of the same century agreed with Savile that it was not genuine, but observed that it had had rather early currency under the name of Chrysostom (*Monitum* in *PG* 59, 485-486). It was quoted by Anastatius Sinaita in his *Interrogationes et responsiones, quaes.* LIX (*PG* 89, 632-636) in the late seventh century (not the sixth century as Montfaucon, *loc. cit.*, states). Seeck, *Untergang*, V (1913), 365-366, *V Anhang*, 583, believes that the sermon as it stands is really the work of Chrysostom, who merely translated the work of St. Ephraim. Baur, II (1930), p. 237, n. 8, has suggested that although the work is patently a forgery, it is not unlikely that even in its present form it was laid before the Empress as the work of Chrysostom.

A homily with the same beginning and apparently similar content was at any rate known to Socrates, VI, 18 (*PG* 67, 717B) and Sozomen, VIII, 20 (*PG* 67, 1568B), who both refer to it as a sermon very well known in their day.

The council which Chrysostom had been urgently requesting the Emperor to convene (wherein he had violated the twelfth Antiochene canon) [64] finally assembled towards the end of 403 A. D., but it was packed with the enemies of Chrysostom, although his supporters appear to have been strong enough to prevent decisive action. We have at any rate no evidence of his formal condemnation by this council. On Christmas of 403 A. D. the Emperor and Empress refused to attend the service in Santa Sophia, although it was a state occasion, and Chrysostom was informed that their absence was necessitated by the serious indictment that still stood against him.[65] Four months passed during which his enemies persisted in their importunities to Arcadius, and Chrysostom with fearless unconcern continued to fulfill his every duty as Patriarch.

When finally Easter was at hand, the opponents of Chrysostom renewed their appeals to Arcadius to expel him as a man twice deposed and excommunicated by a council of Bishops, "and the Emperor wearied by their persistence could not but listen to them, seeing that they were Bishops." Arcadius yielded, and sent to Chrysostom the brief command, "Leave the Church!" The Patriarch answered the Emperor that he had received the Church from God to care for the salvation of his people: "I cannot desert it!" If his leaving was the Emperor's will, however, Chrysostom declared that the latter would have to thrust him out by force, for he could abandon his post only if he might plead that the weight of imperial authority had been too heavy for him. Officers of the imperial guard were sent, and with a show of respect they confined him in the episcopal palace. Easter Eve drew nigh, and three thousand catechumens were to be baptized. Chrysostom was again ordered to "leave the Church," and again his reply was apparently that unless he was prevented by force, he would officiate. In the meantime the Bishops who had remained loyal to Chrysostom, and we are told there were forty of them, approached the Emperor and Empress perhaps on Good Friday (April 15, 404 A. D.), while they were visiting the city martyries. They besought the imperial couple with tears to spare the Church of Christ and to return Chrysostom to Her. Their petition was not heeded. One of the group, Paul of Crateia (in Bithynia), boldly admonished the Empress, "Eudoxia, fear God, and pity your own children: do not dishonor the festival of Christ by the shedding of blood." [66] The words were of prophecy, for two days later on Easter Eve of the year 404 blood was shed in the baptistry of Santa Sophia.[67]

---

[63] Palladius, *Dial.*, 9 (*PG* 47, 30).

[64] Chrysostom himself wrote to Bishop Innocent I of Rome (as reported in Palladius, *Dial.*, 2: *PG* 47, 10), "Upon our re-entry into the city we petitioned the most reverend Emperor to summon a synod to exact retribution for all that had been done." It was thus that he violated the twelfth canon of the Council of Antioch which forbade appeal to the Emperor in just such a situation as Chrysostom now found himself.

[65] Socrates, VI, 18 (*PG* 67, 717B); Sozomen, VIII, 20 (*PG* 67, 1568C).

---

[66] Palladius, *Dial.*, 9 (*PG* 47, 32).

[67] Chrysostom, *Ep. ad Innocentium I*, which is summarized in Palladius, *Dial.*, 2 (*PG* 47, 8-12); Palladius, *Dial.*, 9 (*PG* 47, 33); *Exemplum sacrae Honorii Augusti ad principem Orientis Arcadium* (*PG* 52, 539); Socrates, VI, 18 (*PG* 67, 721A); Sozomen, VIII, 21 (*PG* 67, 1569BC).

The sources are confused (the accounts of Chrysostom and Palladius are irreconcilable), but Sozomen appears to be well informed. Modern historians have commonly followed the account in Sozomen, but with some reservations. Sozomen mentions two attacks upon the clergy and congregation, one on Easter Eve in Santa Sophia and the other on Easter Sunday in the Baths of Constantius (not Constans or Constantine), where they had taken refuge. Chrysostom appears from his own account (*PG* 47, 10) to have been present

The prisons were filled with great numbers of his followers, but Chrysostom continued to reside in the episcopal palace for two more months, months that brought him anxiety for his persecuted flock. Two attempts were made to assassinate him, but the vigilance of the people, who loved him, saved his life.[68] The people, in fact, organized watches day and night around the palace to protect him from the violence to which the court clique would not have scrupled to resort. Acacius and his fellow Bishops became impatient of this seemingly interminable delay: Chrysostom had twice been deposed by an episcopal synod, but he was still Patriarch of Constantinople!

The superstitious awe with which the Empress regarded Chrysostom was the reason why his banishment had been thus deferred. She feared lest his second expulsion might bring a catastrophe like the first, and while Chrysostom was in the city, instant restoration was possible whenever the wrath of God should become manifest. At length Acacius, Severian, Antiochus, and Cyrinus (of Chalcedon) appeared with their supporters in the imperial palace. Their remonstrance to Arcadius, as reported by Palladius (in the *Dialogue* composed only four years after the event), is an interesting declaration by prominent members of the Byzantine episcopate of the superiority of the Emperor over the Bishop. In the audience which Arcadius granted them on the Thursday after Pentecost (June 9, 404) they addressed these words to him: "O Emperor, as by God's appointment you are not under our authority, but have authority over all, you can do whatever you wish. Be not more mild than a priest and more holy than a Bishop." They took the deposition of John "upon their own heads," and urged Arcadius not to be unmerciful to them all in being merciful to one man.[69] The Emperor must have been astonished at such subservience. For almost six years he had

---

in Santa Sophia on Easter Eve in defiance of the Emperor's orders to leave the church.

[68] Sozomen, VIII, 21 (*PG* 67, 1569C-1572AB).

[69] Palladius, *Dial.*, 10 (*PG* 47, 34).

been hearing the sermons of Chrysostom, and the latter even in his most jubilant moods had never set the Emperor above the Bishop. Moreover, had not Chrysostom said, years before, that the Bishop is a prince of more dignity than the Emperor?

Arcadius dispatched the *notarius* Patricius to Chrysostom with the decree of banishment. " Acacius, Antiochus, Severian, and Cyrinus have taken your condemnation upon their own heads," read the pitiful imperial mandate, as though an Emperor had to explain! " Commend, therefore, your affairs to God, and leave the Church." In the sacristy of Santa Sophia, Chrysostom bade a sad farewell to the faithful Bishops who had stood by him, and passing into the baptistry he took leave of Olympias, " a lady who spent all her time in the church," Pentadia, Procla, and Silvina, all of them deaconesses and his spiritual daughters. He directed them to receive as Bishop any worthy successor, who should unwillingly be ordained. " Bow your heads to him as you have done to John. The Church cannot be without a Bishop." [70]

Chrysostom had been warned that troops were ready to expel him from the city if he should prove difficult or if the people should endeavor to assist him. To obviate the possibility of a riot and to shield his people from further violence at the hands of the military, Chrysostom ordered the mule which he usually rode to be tethered at the western porch of the cathedral where the crowds gathered to see him, while he himself hastily departed by a portal on the eastern side of the cathedral.[71] He was met by officers of the imperial guard, and hurried down to the harbor. He was conveyed in a small bark to Bithynia, according to Sozomen, and was presently obliged to continue his long journey to Cucusus, a city near the border of Cilicia and Armenia Secunda.[72] On the very day of his departure the Cathedral of Santa Sophia was completely demolished by a fire, which owing to a strong wind spread to the adjoining Curia. It was charged that the Johannites had set the fire and they were persecuted by the authorities with renewed animosity.[73]

---

[70] *Ibid.*, 10 (*PG* 47, 35).

[71] *Ibid.*, 10 (*PG* 47, 35).

[72] Sozomen, VIII, 22 (*PG* 67, 1572D-1573B).

The Emperor Honorius wrote his brother Arcadius, in remonstrance at the latter's treatment of Chrysostom and the episode of the silver statue, that when the cause of religion was in dispute among priests, judgment should be rendered only by Bishops *(episcopale iudicium)*, for to Bishops pertained the interpretation of things divine and to Emperors the obedience enjoined by religion *(religionis obsequium)*.[74] It would seem that Honorius had learned well the lessons which as a child he had heard St. Ambrose expound.

For three years Chrysostom remained in exile at Cucusus, suffering extreme physical hardship, for in winter the weather was bitterly cold, and he was constantly subjected to the danger of raids from the Isaurian brigands. He was well supplied with funds by wealthy friends in Constantinople who thus risked the imperial displeasure, and "he was exceedingly beloved not only in Armenia, but by all the people of the neighboring countries, and the inhabitants of Antioch as well as other parts of Syria and of Cilicia, and they frequently sought his company."[75] But his enemies feared his increasing influence, and they were gravely disappointed by his persistent refusal to succumb to the difficulties they had imposed upon him. He was finally ordered to take up his abode in Arabissus, where he had already spent the winter of 405-406 A. D. to escape the depredations of the Isaurians, but by imperial command his place of exile was immediately changed to Pityus on the northeastern shore of the Black Sea. The arduous journey and the murderous cruelty of the two praetorians, to whose care he had been committed, proved too much for him, and he died at Comana in Pontus on the way to distant Pityus. It was September 14, 407 A. D. He was buried in the martyry of St. Basiliscus of Comana, and his body lay there for over thirty years when it was finally removed to Constantinople.

---

[73] Palladius, *Dial.*, 10 (*PG* 47, 35-36); Socrates, VI, 18 (*PG* 67, 721A); Sozomen, VIII, 22 (*PG* 67, 1573AB).

The pagan historian Zosimus, V, 24 (Mendelssohn, pp. 245-246), charges the followers of Chrysostom with reckless incendiarism. See Du Cange, *Constantinopolis christiana* (1680), bk. III, pp. 7-8.

[74] *Exemplum sacrae Honorii ad Arcadium* (*PG* 52, 539-540).

[75] Sozomen, VIII, 27 (*PG* 67, 1592AB).

It was then January 27, 438 A. D., and Theodosius II was reigning. When Chrysostom had returned from his first exile thirty-five years before, he had rejoiced that the vast throng turning out to welcome him home had transformed the sea into a city—so crowded was the shore of the Bosphorus.[76] On this return from his second exile, as the historian Theodoret observes, the sea once more took on the appearance of a city. The Emperor himself went out to meet the solemn procession that was bearing the saint's body to the Church of the Apostles, where members of the imperial family and the Bishops of Constantinople were buried. The son of Eudoxia bent low over the body of Chrysostom, and "prayed for his parents and that they who had sinned through ignorance might be pardoned." [77] Chrysostom was interred near the altar of the church where thirty-four years before Eudoxia had been laid to rest and where four years thereafter Arcadius had joined her.[78] In death the Archbishop and the Empress finally found together—within the walls of a church—the peace that in life they were not able to achieve.

---

[76] Chrysostom, *Hom. post red. a priore exsil.*, 3 (*PG* 52, 445).

[77] Theodoret, *H. E.*, V, 36 (*PG* 82, 1265-1268A). *Cf.* Socrates, VII, 45 (*PG* 67, 836AB) and Nicephorus Callistus, XIV, 43 (*PG* 146, 1209B). Nicephorus, *loc. cit.*, gives us the astonishing information that Eudoxia's tomb had been continuously shaken for thirty-five years so that even the Church of the Apostles was jarred by the movement! But when the Emperor Theodosius II asked Chrysostom to intercede with God for his parents, especially his mother, and when the Patriarch's remains had been deposited in the Church, the tomb ceased to tremble, and Nicephorus implies that the Empress had at last found peace.

[78] Du Cange, *Constantinopolis christiana* (1680), bk. IV, pp. 105, 108.

II

Chrysostom's View of the Imperial Office

When the Roman Emperor left his palace, which we understand from Synesius was in itself an event of infrequent occurrence, court etiquette prescribed for him a style of traveling which it was thought befitted his rank. Chrysostom tells us that the Emperor made his way in a panoply of gold. The attendants in his entourage were clad in gold. A pair of white mules accoutred in gold drew the anointed of God in a jewel-studded chariot that made a fine picture as it set the leaves in motion about it. Dragons were embroidered on the Emperor's silk vestments, and his sacred person was protected by an array of gold-embossed shields. There were horses, too, equipped with golden bridle and with trappings that were of gold. But despite all this magnificence, says Chrysostom, whenever one beheld the Emperor, he saw none of these things, for every eye was fixed upon the Emperor himself. His purple cloak, his diadem and throne, his brooch and sandals, the splendor of his countenance—these were the things that held the attention of everyone present.[79]

As a symbol of the imperial office the Emperor gave his prefects tablets of gold.[80] The Emperor alone and no one else possessed the right to wear the purple and to wear upon his head the diadem. The splendor of the imperial equipage defied description. One could but say, He is an Emperor![81]

---

[79] Chrysostom, *De perfecta caritate*, 6 (*PG* 56, 286-287). Chrysostom goes on to compare with the Emperor's passing in full panoply the coming of Christ, who will not come in a golden chariot drawn by a yoke of mules, with dragons embroidered on his clothes and shields arrayed about him, but whose coming will be none the less infinitely more glorious and more fearful. *Cf. Hom. IX in ep. ad Ephes.*, 1 (*PG* 62, 70). On Chrysostom's notices of the vestments, equipage, and attendants of the Emperor see *Synopsis Chrysostomi*, V (*PG* 64, 80).

[80] *Hom. II in Oziam, Vidi dominum*, 2 (*PG* 56, 110).

[81] *Contra Anomoeos*, XII, 4 (*PG* 48, 809); *Ad Theodorum lapsum*, I, 12 (*PG* 47, 293); *Hom. in Ioann. XII*, 1 (*PG* 59, 82).

The Emperor was not lightly to be addressed. An established titulature was followed when petitions were presented to him. His official titles Triumphator *(tropaiouchos)*, Augustus *(augoustos)*, Imperator *(autokrator)*, and still other terms of address, were all written out before the actual *libellus* was begun.[82] Everywhere that the Emperor's life touched the lives of his subjects it was the same; they showed their respect for their sovereign in a multiplicity of ways. In the circus games, for example, the charioteers paid no attention to the applause of the assembled crowd, for they derived neither pleasure nor profit from the approbation of the multitude. (One gathers that Chrysostom had not spent much time at the circus games.) The charioteers reserved their attention for the Emperor alone. The latter sat conspicuously in the middle of the hippodrome, and while the charioteers were attentive to his very nod, they held the vast throng in utter contempt (according to Chrysostom), and only when the Emperor crowned them as victors did their spirits soar.[83]

Chrysostom must have found court etiquette and the Emperor's daily life of very great interest if we may judge by the many references in his various works and the abundant information we may glean therefrom about both the one and the other. But his verdict always was that the cross is a symbol nobler than innumerable diadems and one more proudly to be borne, for while the diadem but adorned the Emperor's brow, it was the cross alone that could fortify his spirit.[84] Thus, in a homily which he delivered in Constantinople in the Church of the Apostles on the fourth anniversary of the death of the Emperor Theodosius, Chrysostom praised Theodosius, "not because he was Emperor, not because he was pious (εὐσεβής), not because his garb was the imperial purple, but because he was clad in Christ, a garment that never becomes worn, and because he had put on the corslet of justice, the sandals of the gospel of peace, the sword of the spirit, the shield of faith, and the helmet of deliverance." [85] Such was the regalia that in Chrysostom's eyes became an Emperor.

---

[82] *Sermo I de Anna*, 5 (*PG* 54, 640).

[83] *Hom. V in genesim*, 6 (*PG* 53, 54).

[84] *Expos. in ps. CIX*, 6 (*PG* 55, 274).

Frequent mention is made of the Emperor in the *Homilies on the Statues,* which Chrysostom delivered in Antioch during March and April of 387 A. D. after the infamous sedition of the city and the desecration by riotous citizens of imperial statues in the public squares and colonnades. Chrysostom was in his second year as presbyter and preacher in the Old Church in Antioch. He told his congregation that " he who has been insulted has not an equal in dignity upon earth; he is an Emperor, the crown and head of all who dwell on earth." [86] He assured his frightened hearers, however, that their Bishop, Flavian, who had gone to Constantinople to intercede with the Emperor in their behalf, would address the Emperor with freedom as well as with prudence. He would certainly succeed in gaining the Emperor's forgiveness for his people. The Bishop had received authority to loose sins committed against God, and so much the more easily could he gain forgiveness for sins committed against a man. The Bishop, in fact, was himself a prince *(archon)* and a prince of more dignity than the Emperor: " the sacred laws take and place under his hand even the royal head, and when there is need of any good thing from above, the Emperor is wont to resort to the priest, but not the priest to the Emperor." [87] The priest, Chrysostom elsewhere declares, was as much more worthy of honor and veneration than the sovereign as the priestly office *(arche)* was greater than the royal office.[88] The Antiochenes were told that he who was angry with them was but a man, " a man of like passions and of like soul," [89] a man who before God was but their fellow slave *(homodoulos)*.[90] Chrysostom has, in fact, represented the Emperor Theodosius as rather curiously describing himself and his subjects as fellow slaves whom it behooved him to forgive, for even the Lord had become a slave *(doulos)* for mankind and was crucified by those whom he had come to save.[91]

---

[85] *Hom. hab. in die Theod. Imp.*, 1 (*PG* 63, 491).
[86] *Hom. de stat. II*, 2 (*PG* 49, 36).
[87] *Hom. de stat. III*, 2 (*PG* 49, 50).
[88] *Hom. de Anna II*, 4 (*PG* 54, 648).
[89] *Hom. de stat. IV*, 2 (*PG* 49, 62).
[90] *Hom. de stat. III*, 6 (*PG* 49, 56).

When Theodosius had at first remonstrated that the offense of the Antiochenes was an insult and an injustice beyond what past Emperors had ever endured, Flavian, says Chrysostom, answered, " If you but wish, O most humane, most wise, and most pious Emperor (*ὦ φιλανϑρωπότατε καὶ φιλοσοφώτατε καὶ πολλῆς εὐσεβείας γέμων*), this very contempt they have shown you will earn for you a crown exceeding in honor and splendor your imperial diadem." Mankind would applaud Theodosius for his superiority over wrath, and for that future generations would admire him.[92] Flavian's address to the Emperor was in Chrysostom's opinion a model of tact and deference, and Chrysostom was very conscious of what was *prepon* in addressing sovereigns. Thus in his discussion of the priest Azariah's reproaching King Uzziah for having burned incense upon the altar and ordering him to leave the sanctuary (2 Chronicles 26: 16), Chrysostom emphasizes the dignity and restraint of the priest. The latter did not approach the King and abuse him as " O unclean and foulest of men " (*ὦ μιαρὲ καὶ παμμίαρε*), for example, but he told him quietly that his conduct had been unlawful and that he should leave the sanctuary upon which he had trespassed without right.[93]

Although Chrysostom thus appreciates the fact that there is a right way and a wrong way of addressing the sovereign, he enjoys himself no conspicuous success in pursuing the right way in his dealings with the imperial family over a period of some six years. Whenever he addresses the Emperor or Empress in his extant works, he is generally either excessively flattering or fluently abusive. He seldom achieves the mean. In his letter of remonstrance to the Empress Eudoxia, however, out of two hundred and forty-three extant letters the only one addressed to a member of the imperial family, it is interesting to note he does follow his own precept. The Empress having unjustly deprived the widow of Theognostus of her vineyard is reminded quietly that all men are equal before God; royal power has been bestowed by God, not that the sovereign may be exalted over his fellow men, but that he may be able to administer justice *(dikaiosyne)*. (Azariah did not call Uzziah King, Chrysostom similarly observes in his discussion of the passage in 2 Chronicles noted above, for the latter had stripped himself of that honor; the wrong-doer is a slave *(doulos)*, though he wears ten thousand crowns upon his head. But the man who practices justice *(dikaiosyne)*, even if he would seem to be the lowliest of men, surpasses in dignity the Emperor himself).[94] The only term of direct address in the letter to Eudoxia is the conventional title "your Piety" (ἡ ὑμῶν ϑεοφίλεια).[95] But the Empress was not much less offended, as the reader will recall from our reference to the episode in the first section of this chapter, than if he had roundly abused her in his customary fashion.

---

[91] *Hom. de stat. XXI*, 4 (*PG* 49, 219-220).

[92] *Hom. de stat. XXI*, 3 (*PG* 49, 216).

[93] *In illud, Vidi dominum, hom. V*, 2 (*PG* 56, 132): *Ecloga XXI: de imperio* (*PG* 63, 697). *Cf.* the very similar discussion of the restraint of Nathan in addressing David in a homily which is, however, spurious (*In ps. L hom.*, 6: *PG* 55, 572).

Chrysostom makes it clear that in society there is a place both for sovereigns and for priests.[96] The office of the king and that of the priest possess each its own "home grounds" (οἰκεῖοι ὅροι). But the priesthood is greater than the kingship. Precious stones and golden raiment do not constitute the real significance of royal power. Their appearance is awe-inspiring (and we have seen that they impressed Chrysostom himself enough to take careful and extensive note of them), but the king's function is to exercise control over earthly things. Sacerdotal authority, however, derives its sanction *(thesmos)* from heaven, and whatsoever the priest ordains on earth, God confirms in heaven. " The king has been entrusted with affairs here on earth," declares Chrysostom; " I have been entrusted with the affairs of heaven—when I say ' I ', I mean the priest." Bodies are entrusted to the king, but men's souls have been entrusted to the priest. The king reduces tax obligations, but it is the priest who reduces the guilt of sins. Force is the royal prerogative, but the priest works by persuasion. Material weapons (ὅπλα αἰσϑητά) are employed by the king whereas the priest avails himself of spiritual weapons (πνευματικά). " The former contends against the barbarians, but my struggle is against demons." The office *(arche)* of the priest stands higher than that of the king. The king's head, therefore, has been placed under the hands of the priest.[97]

---

[94] *In illud, Vidi dominum, hom. V*, 2 (*PG* 56, 131): *Ecloga XXI, de imperio* (*PG* 63, 697).

[95] *Ep. ad Imp. Eudox.* (*Suppl. ad epp.*: *PG* 64, 493, 496).

[96] *In ps. CXXI expos.*, 2 (*PG* 55, 349-350).

But Chrysostom would not have us under-estimate the dignity and authority of the sovereign. He observes that David spared Saul " because he was the Lord's anointed *(christos)*." Likewise if imperial appointees in the government are wicked and unjust, if they are thieves and plunderers, whatever they are in fact, the reverence due to the Emperor who appointed them entitles them to respect and obedience. Rulers are ordained of God, and whoever resists them resists the ordinance of God.[98] Chrysostom recognizes as the evil of imperial power, however, the fact that it leads to pride and arrogance, and these are to be condemned in any man, whether commoner or Emperor.[99] It is character *(arete)* and wisdom *(philosophia)* that men should strive after, not the honor and power of an Emperor, for such power must result in many an act displeasing to God. The loftier a man's station, the greater the perils and the cares that beset him.[100]

---

[97] *In illud, Vidi dominum, hom. IV*, 4-5 (*PG* 56, 126): *Ecloga XXI, de imperio* (*PG* 63, 697).

[98] *De Davide et Saule hom. I*, 6 (*PG* 54, 685).

[99] *In ep. ad Coloss. hom. VII*, 4 (*PG* 62, 348).

[100] *Ecloga XXI: de imperio* (*PG* 63, 695).

The true sovereign is thus the ruler of his own passions, envy, and pleasure, while he subjects all things to the laws of God, preserves an open mind *(nous eleutheros),* and does not allow the tyranny of pleasure to overcome his own soul. Such a man Chrysostom would gladly behold in command of the sea and the land, cities, peoples, and armies, for such a man would exercise his rule over his fellow men in accordance with the laws of God (μετὰ τῶν ϑείων νόμων). He would be to his subjects as a father to his children. He would deal gently with cities. But the ruler who is a slave to passion, ambition, and pleasure is first of all ridiculous *(katagelastos)* in his subjects' eyes, because he wears in pompous fashion a gold and gem-studded crown, but is not crowned with self-control *(sophrosyne),* because his whole body gleams with purple, but his soul is unkempt. How in very truth can the man who cannot rule over himself impose law and order upon others?[101] It is easy to terrorize a city into subjection. It is more difficult for the sovereign to gain the good will of his people, but it is worth any effort that it may be necessary to expend. Nothing so distinguishes a ruler as the love he shows for his subjects. Begetting an offspring does not by itself make a father, but love and devotion to the child as it grows up are no less necessary to parenthood.[102] In a social as well as a political sense the Emperor should be a *pater patriae.*

Chrysostom like St. Ambrose with whom we have from time to time compared him believes that all men have within themselves the law of nature *(physikos nomos),* which sounds out for them what is good *(kalon)* and what is not.[103] Chrysostom contrasts man-made with divine law; the former is transitory and varies with circumstances, but the latter is true and is eternal.[104] This was the common patristic attitude, as we have observed before, and behind it lay a background of Stoic thought into which we cannot enter here. Reduced to its ultimate conclusion, however, this attitude would do away with the imperial power entirely. Although there appears to be no passage in which Chrysostom explicitly states the fact, it would seem that is what he would have liked. The patristic attitude towards the *imperium* was basically anarchic, but the imperial government was recognized as a very necessary evil, necessary because of man's lamentable inadequacy and his apparent inability to live by the law that God had implanted *(physikos nomos)* in his heart. It was for this reason too that God had established governmental authority and that Chrysostom enjoins obedience to that authority as being of divine origin (he quotes Romans 13: 1).[105]

---

[101] *Comparatio regis et monachi,* 2 (*PG* 47, 388-389): *Ecloga XXI, de imperio* (*PG* 63, 695).

[102] *Ecloga XXI, de imperio* (*PG* 63, 697).

[103] *In ps. CXLVII expos.,* 3 (*PG* 55, 482).

[104] *In ps. CX expos.,* 6 (*PG* 55, 287-289).

The association of God and the Emperor was such that with Chrysostom as with all the Fathers of the fourth century comparisons between God and the Emperor were frequent. The reader will recall more especially perhaps Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius. Chrysostom once told his Antiochene congregation that divine law was sent down from heaven for man's salvation. It should ever be heeded. If when a communication from the Emperor was read, great silence prevailed, and all tumult and disturbance disappeared, as everyone strained his hearing to learn the content of the imperial message, and whoever created ever so slight a distraction from the reading was in grave danger, with how much more fear and trembling must they stand by, preserving complete silence and warding off confusion from their thoughts, so that they might understand the scripture lesson he had just read to them, and so that the Emperor of heaven approving their obedience might honor them with greater gifts than any earthly monarch could bestow upon them.[106] Chrysostom elsewhere observed that such respect was shown to the Emperors that cases of adultery and drunkenness occurring in the imperial palace were punishable by death. How much more serious then were such crimes when committed in the sight of God, "that Emperor who is present everywhere and beholds all things that happen!"[107]

---

[105] *Ecloga XXI, de imperio* (*PG* 63, 696).

[106] *Hom. XIV in genesim, 2* (*PG* 53, 112).

Divinely ordained like all governmental authority to meet man's inadequacy, the imperial power, perhaps on account of that inadequacy, was slippery and insecure because of wars, intrigues, and envy, Chrysostom declares, "and quite apart from these things it is not in itself worthy of consideration."[108] The Emperor shared all the ills of other men, and that man alone is happy who fears the Lord. When sickness came upon the Emperor, what good were his court functionaries and his brilliant equipage? In the presence of domestics, relatives, and heaven knows whom else, the Emperor breathed his last while his purple-clad body decked out with gold above and gold below had to lie as though burning in a furnace.[109] After all the turmoil of his life an Emperor could not even die in peace.

[107] *Hom. V in Ioann.*, 4 (*PG* 59, 60).

[108] *Ad Theodorum lapsum*, I, 12 (*PG* 47, 293).

[109] *In ps. XLI expos.*, 7 (*PG* 55, 166).

CHAPTER VIII

IMPERIAL IMAGES

IMAGES of the Emperors were displayed the length and breadth of the Empire in almost every place where it was proper to put them. Their setting, however, had to be one worthy of them. A law of 394 A. D., for example, orders that pictures, apparently advertisements, of actors, charioteers, and the like should be removed from public porticoes and other places "in which (imperial) images are wont to be consecrated."[1] Severian, Bishop of Gabala and bitter opponent of St. John Chrysostom at Constantinople, asks the reader in a work long erroneously attributed to Chrysostom to "consider how many officials there are throughout the whole world, and since an Emperor cannot be present to all persons, it is necessary to set up the statue of the Emperor in law-courts, market-places, public assemblies, and theaters—in every place, in fact, in which an official acts, the imperial effigy must be present, so that the Emperor may thus confirm what takes place, for the Emperor is only a human being, and he cannot be everywhere."[2]

Imperial statuary, observes Chrysostom, was wrought not only of gold and silver, and other precious metals, but even of bronze. Although from Hellenistic times statues of gold and silver, as opposed to those of baser metals, would seem to have been tantamount to divine honors, and during the earlier Empire images of the Emperor intended for *cultus,* it would appear, were properly made in precious metals,[3] Chrysostom expressly states that the difference in materials (the use of baser metals, wood, etc.) did not in any way detract from the worth and dignity of the image. The value or lack of value of the material used in its manufacture had nothing to do with the worth and dignity of the image, for the very fact of imperial portrayal (ὁ βασιλικὸς τύπος) imparted to all materials an equal majesty.[4] St. Methodius at the beginning of the fourth century had declared that images of the Emperors, even if they were not made of the more precious metals, gold and silver, were still honored by all men. Men did not honor images of the more precious material to scorn those made of baser material, but they honored them all alike, even those made of gypsum and of bronze. The man who had insulted either type of image, therefore, was not absolved on the grounds that he merely attached no value to clay or to gold, but he was condemned for his profanity against the one who was his Emperor and Lord (ἀλλ' ὡς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀσεβήσας τὸν βασιλέα καὶ κύριον).[5] Under Christian influence a certain change has thus come about in the attitude towards imperial images, as we see from Chrysostom's statement and the earlier part of Methodius's statement. It is, however, a change such as we should expect, since Christians, although they "adored" (*adorare*), did not "worship" (*colere*) imperial effigies, wherein they differed apparently from pagans of earlier generations. We shall return to the fine distinction between worship and adoration of imperial images, since it is perhaps the most important aspect of the Christian attitude toward such images.

---

[1] *C. Th.* XV, 7, 12 (Mommsen, p. 824).

[2] Severian of Gabala (*inter opera Chrysostomi*), *De mundi creatione orat. V*, 5 (*PG* 56, 489).

[3] See Kenneth Scott, "The Significance of Statues in Precious Metals in Emperor Worship," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, LXII (1931), 101-123.

Before we consider the Christian attitude in detail, however, it may be well for purposes of comparison to understand something of a cultured pagan's view of imperial images in the preceding century. The historian Cassius Dio puts his own view into the mouth of Maecenas, whom he represents as advising Augustus to accept the Empire in 29 B. C., while the latter is cautioned against the acceptance of divine honors. "Earn then for yourself any additional splendor by your own good deeds," Maecenas told Augustus, "and you must never allow gold or even silver statues of yourself to be made, for not only are they expensive but they even court disaster while they endure but a brief while, but rather by your benefactions fashion other images in the very hearts of mankind, images that will never tarnish and will prove immortal. . . It is virtue and courage that make many men the equal of the gods, and no one was ever elected god by mere show of hands, so that if you are a man of character and a ruler of capacity . . . all men will be your cult-images, because in their thoughts you will ever be enshrined in glory."[6] Although our present problem concerns real images of the Emperor, and not those in the hearts of men, I cannot forbear to call attention to an almost exactly similar point of view to which Chrysostom gives expression. After the sedition at Antioch in 386 A. D. when the city mob desecrated the imperial images with reckless disregard of possible consequences and then waited in terror for the Emperor's decision in the matter, Chrysostom told the Antiochenes of their Bishop's efforts in their behalf. The Emperor was told that the statues which had been thrown down might be replaced by others more glorious. Imperial forgiveness for the offense of the Antiochenes would lead all men to erect to the Emperor a statue, not of bronze or of gold or of inlaid gems, and placed in the market place, but a statue of humanity and tender mercy graven in the hearts of men. To posterity the Emperor would thus bequeath a statue of unfailing permanence that all men would admire and cherish just as if they too had experienced his kindness.[7] Whatever the difference between pagan and Christian attitudes towards imperial images, we find here a deep and striking resemblance.

---

[4] Chrysostom, *In Maccabaeos*, fragm. (*PG* 50, 627-628), quoted by John of Damascus, *De imaginibus orat. III* (*PG* 94, 1408B).

[5] Methodius, *De resurrectione orat. II*, fragm. (*PG* 18, 289AB), quoted by John of Damascus, *Orat. III* (*PG* 94, 1420B).

Adoration was paid either to the Emperor or to his image, and image and Emperor were identical before the law and in curious fashion in the thought of the period. Like most of the

---

[6] Cassius Dio, LII, 35 (Boissevain, II, 406: Melber, III, 70-71).

[7] Chrysostom, *Hom. de stat. XXI*, 3 (*PG* 49, 216).

Fathers of the fourth century St. Athanasius frequently compares God with the Emperor. In trying to explain the divine mystery, the unity of the Father and the Son, Athanasius slips easily into the comparison which involves the Emperor's image. The Son and the Father are one, for the Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son. We may illustrate this, observes Athanasius, by a comparison with the Emperor's image, for in the image is the shape and form of the Emperor, and in the Emperor is that shape which is in the image. A person who looks at the image sees in it the Emperor, and he on the other hand who sees the Emperor recognizes that it is he who is in the image. Whoever, therefore, adores the image, also adores therein the Emperor (ὁ γοῦν προσκυνῶν τὴν εἰκόνα, ἐν αὐτῇ προσκυνεῖ καὶ τὸν βασιλέα). Since then the Son is likewise the Father's image, it must necessarily be understood that the godhead of the Father is the Being of the Son.[8]

In a very similar passage Basil the Great observes that although the image of the Emperor is referred to as " the Emperor ", this does not mean that there are two Emperors. Neither is the Empire torn asunder, nor the glory thereof divided. Just as the Empire (ἀρχή) and the power (ἐξουσία) of the Emperor over his subjects remain one, so also does the Christian doxology have reference to one God and not many, for honor that is shown to an image redounds to the honor of that which the image portrays (ἡ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει). What the image therefore in the one case accomplishes through pictorial likeness (μιμητικῶς), in the other the Son achieves by identity of nature (φυσικῶς).[9] Cyril of Jerusalem remarks that the wooden image of the earthly sovereign is honored (τιμᾶται), and so how much the more should the rational image (εἰκὼν λογική) of God be honored![10]

---

[8] Athanasius, *Contra Arianos orat. III*, 5 (*PG* 26, 332B). The same passage occurs among the spurious writings of Athanasius: *Excerptus sermo de sacris imaginibus* (*PG* 28, 709BC). It is also quoted by John of Damascus, *Orat. III* (*PG* 94, 1404D-1405A).

[9] Basil, *De spiritu sancto*, 45 (*PG* 32, 149C), quoted by John of Damascus, *Orat. I* (*PG* 94, 1261D) ; *Orat. III* (*PG* 94, 1361AD). *Cf.* also Basil, *Hom. XXIV: Contra Sabellianos et Arium et Anomoeos*, 4 (*PG* 31, 608AB).

Another comparison for purposes of religious instruction between God and the Emperor occurs in one of St. John Chrysostom's homilies *De laudibus S. Pauli Apostoli.* It relates to the so-called cult of the military standards. Whenever those who bear on the standard-shafts the images of the Emperors (τὰ σημεῖα . . . τὰ βασιλικά) enter cities, with the trumpet playing before them and soldiers marching on ahead, the whole populace is wont to run together both to hear the military music and to behold the imperial images held aloft, not to speak of admiring the strength of the stalwart soldiers who bear them. But Paul, too, is a standard-bearer, and this day he has entered not a city, but the world. For him, too, all should assemble. Paul bears not the image of the sovereign of this world, but the cross of Christ, who reigns in heaven; it is not men who precede him, but angels, both in honor of the standard being borne and for the safety of the one who bears it.[11]

Severian of Gabala, whom we have already cited on the fact that images of the Emperor were everywhere to be seen, says that if in the absence of the Emperor his image (*eikon*) takes the place of the imperial presence, and if the magistrates adore it (καὶ προσκυνοῦσιν ἄρχοντες), and the festivities of the month are thus properly observed, and the magistrates come forward to meet the imperial effigy, and the populace adores it (καὶ δῆμοι προσκυνοῦσιν), not as though they were looking upon a picture, but upon the very face of the Emperor, although they do not see him in the flesh, but only in a portrait—how much the more, then, can the image of the immortal Emperor force its way through not only stone, but even heaven and all the earth![12]

---

[10] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis XII, De Christo incarnato,* 5 (*PG* 33, 732A), quoted by John of Damascus, *Orat. III* (*PG* 94, 1405C).

[11] Chrysostom, *Hom. VII* (*PG* 50, 507-508). *Cf.* the passage quoted from Chrysostom by John of Damascus, *Orat. III* (*PG* 94, 1408C).

[12] Severian of Gabala, *In crucem sanctam,* quoted by John of Damascus, *Orat. III* (*PG* 94, 1409A).

Gregory of Nyssa uses a comparison involving the Emperor's image to illustrate the dignity of man, but since man was made in the image of God, this is but a variant of the same device that we have found so frequent in the Fathers. Gregory says that just as it is the common practice among men for manufacturers of imperial images to give the proper shape and character to their material, and then indicate the imperial rank of their subject by adorning the image with purple, and according to custom the image is referred to as the Emperor, so likewise human nature, since it was created to rule over other things, has been set up as a sort of living statue (ἔμψυχος εἰκών), sharing both the dignity and name of its archetype.[13]

John of Damascus quotes a passage from Basil's commentary on Isaiah to the effect that when the evil-doer saw man made according to the image and likeness of God, not being able to turn upon God, he spent his evil wrath upon the image of God, just as an angry man stones the image of the Emperor, since he cannot do so to the Emperor himself.[14]

The imperial statues symbolized the power of the reigning Emperor, and were properly objects of great veneration. Theodosius in 386 A. D., the year before the Antiochene sedition, invested the imperial effigies (*imperatoria simulacra*) with the right of ten days asylum for fugitives.[15] A law of 381 A. D. speaks indignantly of the coiner of false coins as one " who copies our sacred mouth and strives to reproduce our divine countenance, and, master of sacrilege, has stamped upon coins our revered forms." [16] By official usage after Constantine defeated rivals or usurpers whose quest for imperial power did not succeed were known as *tyranni*.[17] The images of *tyranni* were destroyed, and Ambrose remarks that it was a criminal offense to possess one.[18] In the time of Gregory Nazianzen the mutilated statues of the persecutor Maximin Daia were still standing; thus did his images (*eikones*) bring home to the world in striking symbolism what his punishment had been.[19]

---

[13] Gregory of Nyssa, *De hominis opificio*, 4 (*PG* 44, 136C), quoted by John of Damascus, *Orat. I* (*PG* 94, 1268D-1269A).

[14] John of Damascus, *De imaginibus orat. III* (*PG* 94, 1365BC), which seems to be a paraphrase of Basil, *In Isaiam prophetam*, 267 (*PG* 30, 589B).

[15] *C. Th.*, VIIII, 44, 1 (Mommsen, p. 518).

[16] *Ibid.*, VIIII, 38, 6 (Mommsen, p. 497).

[17] *Ibid.*, XV, 14, 1 and ff.

Following their great fourth century predecessors, Athanasius, Basil, and Chrysostom, Anastasius of Antioch in the sixth century and John of Damascus in the eighth are still using comparisons of the Emperor and God, involving imperial images, for purposes of argument and instruction.[20]

Worship of the Emperor's statues survived into the fourth century and beyond, if worship is the proper word for the imperial *proskynesis,* and was very common among Christians, who made obeisance before imperial images, as abundant evidence from the Fathers indicates, as an honor owed to the Emperor. Gregory Nazianzen says in his first invective against Julian that one of the Romans' most cherished customs was to honor Emperors with public images (*eikones demosiai*).[21] He did not know, he claims, whether it was this way among all peoples where royalty existed, but certainly the crowns and diadems, the purple robes and palace guards, the multitude of their subjects were not enough to establish the sovereignty of the Roman Emperors. They had also to be accorded adoration (*proskynesis*); they had to appear more awesome than other men. But it was not enough that they should receive adoration in person; their statues and pictures had also to be adored in order that they might thus receive a more complete and unqualified veneration.[22] Having thus indicated what he conceived to be the nature and purpose of Emperor-" worship ", Gregory proceeds to describe a specific example of its occurrence which he regards with especial abhorrence. The Emperor Julian, like those who mix poison with food, had intruded his impiety (*asebeia*) into the honors customarily paid an Emperor. Roman law and the worship of idols were combined when Julian associated his own portraits (*eikones*) with pictures (*graphai*) of various deities (*daimones*), and saw to it that they should have wide currency throughout the Empire.

---

[18] Ambrose, *De officiis,* I, 244 (*PL* 16, 95C): "Si tyranni aliquis imaginem habeat, nonne obnoxius est damnationi?" *Cf. In ps. enarr. XXXVIII,* 27 (*CSEL* 64, p. 204): "Si quis tyranni imagines habeat, qui iam victus interiit, iure damnatur." Also, *De interpell. Iob et David,* III (IV), 24 (*CSEL* 32: 2, p. 262): "Vide quemadmodum in civitatibus bonorum principum imagines perseverent, deleantur imagines tyrannorum."

[19] Gregory Nazian., *Orat. IV,* 96 (*PG* 35, 629B).

[20] Anastasius of Antioch, *De sabbato, I fragm.* (*PG* 89, 1405AB), and quoted by John of Damascus, *De imaginibus orat. II* (*PG* 94, 1316CD); *cf. Orat. III* (1412BC). John of Damascus, *Orat. I,* 4 (*PG* 94, 1236BC); *Orat. III,* 6 (1325A); *scholium* on Basil, *De spiritu sancto,* 18 (*sec.* 45 in *PG* 32, 149C) in *Orat. I* (*PG* 94, 1264AB).

[21] Gregory Nazian., *Orat. IV,* 80 (*PG* 35, 605B).

Gregory represents the Christians as caught on either horn of a dilemma. If they duly honored the Emperor, *eo ipso* they honored the idols; if they shunned the idols, they insulted the Emperor, for so had the worship of the two been commingled. It is important to note that what distresses Gregory is apparently not the worship or adoration of imperial images, but the adoration of pictures of the pagan deities (*daimones*).

Some few Christians, we are told, realized the snare that had been set for them. They refused to make obeisance to the Emperor and his gods. Their scrupulosity was punished on the ground that they had offended against the Emperor; " but actually," says Gregory, " because they had braved the danger for their true Sovereign and their religion." But most of the Christians would seem to have been less cautious, and the imperial stratagem made them unconscious subscribers to idolatry.[23] There can thus be no doubt that a distinction existed in Gregory's mind between the *adoratio* or *proskynesis* of imperial images on the one hand and on the other of images of the pagan divinities. He does not make a clear distinction between *proskynesis* and true worship or *latreia,* such as we shall observe in Origen, in the author of an anonymous Christian dialogue of the fourth century, and in Procopius of Gaza; but Gregory seems to imply such a distinction. He would have done well, however, to define more clearly the difference between *latreia* and *proskynesis* where imperial images were concerned. After considering some further important evidence of the adoration of imperial images and related matters, we shall turn to writers who are at pains to illustrate the difference between adoring and truly worshipping the images of the Emperors.

---

[22] *Ibid.*, 80 (*PG* 35, 605C).

[23] *Ibid.*, 81 (*PG* 35, 608AB). *Cf.* the episode described in *Orat. IV*, 82-84 (608-612) with Libanius, *Orat. XVIII*, 199 (Förster, II, 323).

Interesting confirmation of the fact that in the fourth century Christians were adoring imperial images is to be found in a passage from the Arian historian Philostorgius. It is a great misfortune that the twelve books of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Philostorgius have survived only in an epitome from the pen of the ninth century patriarch Photius.[24] Photius says that his author, whom he calls an enemy of God and clearly regards as a liar, accused Christians of offering sacrifices to an image of Constantine placed upon a column of porphyry and of honoring it with lighted lamps and incense, while they offered prayers to it as to God and made supplications to it to ward off calamities.[25] In the light of contemporary evidence the account in Philostorgius is entirely credible.

The historian Socrates says that Constantine turned in disgust from pagan superstition, and then adds in the same breath that the Emperor set up his own statues in the temples.[26] Eusebius, however, says to the contrary that Constantine forbade the setting up of his images in temples, so that not even his pictures (*skiagraphiai*) might be contaminated by the error of pagan superstition.[27] Eusebius adds that Constantine had himself represented on gold coins and in widely circulated portraits as engaged in prayer to God.[28] The news of Constantine's death according to Eusebius was received at Rome as the heaviest and most lamentable of calamities. Paintings were dedicated to his memory. " The design of these pictures embodied a representation of heaven itself," says Eusebius, " and depicted the Emperor reposing in an ethereal mansion above the celestial vault." [29]

---

[24] The best edition of Philostorgius is by Joseph Bidez in *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller*, vol. 21 (1913).

[25] Philostorgius, II, 17 (*PG* 65, 479A: Bidez, *GCS* 21, p. 28).

[26] Socrates, I, 18 (*PG* 67, 121B).

[27] Eusebius, *Vita Constant.*, IV, 16 (*PG* 20, 1164BC: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 123).

[28] *Ibid.*, IV, 15 (*PG* 20, 1164AB: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 123).

St. Ambrose asks in discussing the relative merits of different parts of the human body, What is man without a head since the whole being of man is in the head? When you see the head, you recognize the man; if the head is missing, there can be no recognition. Ordinarily only the heads of Emperors, for example, are cast in bronze, and their features drawn from bronze or marble (there is no mention here of gold and silver statues) are adored by men (*ab hominibus adorantur*).[30] Such a casual reference to performing obeisance before imperial effigies would seem to indicate indifference to the practice. There is here at any rate no word of opposition from Ambrose. The latter elsewhere remarks that whoever crowns the image of the Emperor honors thereby the one whose image he has crowned, and whoever has shown his scorn of the Emperor's statue is regarded as having done injury to the Emperor whose statue he insulted.[31] While Ambrose himself, it is safe to say, would never have rendered the Emperor the extreme homage of *adoratio,* he was clearly unwilling to make an issue of other persons' doing so. It would appear that in the fourth century Christians, although not Bishops, regularly performed *adoratio* before the Emperor or his statue.

---

[29] *Ibid.*, IV, 69 (*PG* 20, 1224CD: Heikel, *GCS* 7, p. 146). *Cf.* Theodoret and Polichronius, *In Ezechielem,* quoted by John of Damascus, *Orat. III* (*PG* 94, 1380B).

[30] Ambrose, *Exameron,* VI, 57 (*CSEL* 32: 1, p. 248).

[31] Ambrose, *Expositio ps. CXVIII,* 10, 25 (*CSEL* 62, p. 219) : " Qui enim coronat imaginem imperatoris, utique illum honorat cuius imaginem coronat, et qui statuam contempserit imperatoris, imperatori utique cuius statuam consputaverit fecisse videtur iniuriam." Almost exactly the same statements are made in the sixth century by Anastatius of Antioch, *De sabbato, I fragm.* (*PG* 89, 1405ABC), and quoted by John of Damascus, *Orat. III* (*PG* 94, 1412C) and *Orat. II* (1316CD).

But this practice with its pagan past and pagan associations met with opposition from a few Fathers, most notably perhaps from St. Jerome. That Jerome did not regard the adoration of the Emperor as an honor which Christians might render to the anointed of God is very clear from a passage in his commentary on Daniel. King Nebuchadnezzar had set up an image of gold at Dura in the province of Babylon, and everyone was ordered to prostrate himself before the image (Daniel 3: 1-6). (The word *proskynesis* is used in the Septuagint.) The story of the three Jews who refused to prostrate themselves before the image need not be recounted here, but the point is that Jerome could see no difference between *proskynesis* before the statue of Nebuchadnezzar (*cultores Dei . . . adorare non debent*) and that performed before the statue of the Emperor. Therefore, let provincial governors (*iudices*) and the dignitaries of this world (*principes saeculi*), who adore statues of the Emperors, understand that they are doing the very thing which the three young men in Daniel refused to do and earned thereby the favor of God.[32] Although the position of Jerome is what we might have expected from the Fathers, it is exceptional, as we have seen, and differs completely from what we must observe to have been the prevailing patristic attitude in the fourth century. We should note, further, that not only does Jerome fail like Gregory Nazianzen to distinguish between adoration and true worship (*cultus*), but he does not like the latter imply that any such distinction was possible. Jerome simply condemns adoration of imperial images.

Origen in the first half of the third century, however, in commenting on the Lord's commandment against images in Exodus 20: 5, "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them" (οὐ προσκυνήσεις αὐτοῖς, οὐδὲ λατρεύσεις), observes that true worship (*latreia*) is one thing, and adoration (*proskynesis*) is quite another. Whoever serves with all his soul not only adores (προσκυνεῖ), he also worships (λατρεύει). But whoever merely pretends (καθυποκρινόμενος), acting according to custom, does not worship, he merely adores.[33] To illustrate this distinction between true worship and adoration in Latin terms, we may use Rufinus's translation of this passage from Origen in the longer recension of the text. Worship and adoration are quite different (*aliud est colere, aliud adorare*). Some persons in deference to the Emperors (*nonnulli regibus adulantes*) make a pretense of adoring his images (*adorare se simulant idola*), although in their hearts they know that the image is nothing (*quia nihil est idolum*).[34]

---

[32] Jerome, *In Danielem*, III, 18 (*PL* 25, 530C).

But this difference is defined more clearly still in the Latin rendering of this same passage in the commentary on Exodus of Procopius of Gaza (*fl.* 500 A. D.). He who worships idols, says Procopius, also adores them (*qui idola colit, is etiam adorat*), but he who adores them does not necessarily worship them (*at qui adorat, non continuo et colit*). Worship (*cultus*) proceeds from the heart devoted to the image (*ex animo imagini propenso*). But adoration or obeisance (*adoratio*) is performed by a certain movement of the body, and it is the outward expression of inward worship (*species cultus*).[35] We can now understand that the *adoratio* rendered by Christians to imperial images was supposed to be a superficial gesture of respect, and with this understanding of the nature of Christian adoration of the Emperor we can consider the rather labored distinction attempted by an anonymous writer about the middle of the fourth century. However, a few words of introduction to the next work may not be amiss.

A generation ago the attention of the learned world was called to the fourth century dialogue known as the *Consulta-*

---

[33] Origen, *In Exodum hom. VIII*, 4 (*PG* 12, 354C). The Greek text is extant only in fragments. The same fragment in a different recension is given in W. A. Baehrens, *GCS* 29, p. 223. The Latin text of Rufinus, analyzed above, is a translation of the latter version. To avoid duplication I summarize the shorter Greek and longer Latin versions.

[34] Rufinus, *Origenes in Exodum hom. VIII*, 4 (*PG* 12, 354C: Baehrens, *GCS* 29, p. 223).

[35] Procopius of Gaza, *In Exodum* (XX, 5), *secc.* 273-274 in *PG* 87: 1, 607-608.

tiones Zacchaei et Apollonii, which was attributed by Dom Germain Morin to Julius Firmicus Maternus,[36] whose name appears on the title page of Morin's edition of the work for the *Florilegium patristicum.*[37] But the result of recent research has been to cast grave doubts upon, and even to disprove, Morin's contention that Firmicus wrote the *Consultationes.*[38] The problem of alleged Firmican authorship, however, is no concern of ours in the present study. The work is a dialogue more or less in the tradition of Minucius Felix between the Christian Zacchaeus and the pagan philosopher Apollonius. They had been discussing pagan oracles when the subject of

---

[36] Germain Morin, "Ein zweites christliches Werk des Firmicus Maternus: *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii,*" *Historisches Jahrbuch,* XXXVII (1916), pp. 229-66.

[37] *I. Firmici Materni Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii*... edidit Germanus Morin, *Florilegium patristicum,* fasc. 39 (Bonn, 1935).

[38] August Reatz, "Die Theologie der *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* mit Berücksichtigung ihrer mutmasslichen Beziehungen zu J. Firmicus Maternus," *Der Katholik,* XXII (1918), pp. 300-314, was at first inclined to agree with Morin that in the *Consultationes* we possessed a second Christian work of Firmicus. Two years later, however, Reatz published a more exhaustive study in which he declared after detailed analyses of the literary style and theological content of the *De errore* and *Consultationes* that both these works could not have been written by a single author (*Das theologische System der Consultationes... mit Berücksichtigung ihrer angeblichen Beziehung zu J. Firmicus Maternus,* Freiburg-i.-B., 1920; *cf.* also Reatz in *Lexikon f. Theologie u. Kirche,* IV, Freiburg-i.-B., 1932, p. 14.). Dom Morin's attribution of the *Consultat.* to Firmicus has been accepted by J. Stiglmayr, *Theologische Revue,* XX (1921), pp. 186-87, and by A. Souter, *Journal of Theological Studies,* XXXVI (1935), pp. 107-8. The most effective opponent of Morin in assigning the work to Firmicus has been Bertil Axelson, "Ein drittes Werk des Firmicus Maternus?" *Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i. Lund, Arsberättelse* 1936-37, pp. 107-32. Axelson insists that Morin's method of establishing the authorship of the *Consultat.* on the basis of parallel passages appearing in one or both of the admittedly genuine works of Firmicus and the *Consultat.* (Morin prints 117 *locutiones Firmicanae* as an appendix to the Bonn edition) is inadequate, and on the basis of the very examples chosen to prove Firmican authorship, the work could be assigned to more than one well known author of the 4th or 5th century. Morin and Reatz agreed in dating the *Consultat.* about 360 A. D., but Axelson would date the work not earlier than the beginning of the fifth century. In this case, as so often in classical letters, we probably shall have to be content with anonymity.

Emperor-worship arose. Apollonius had informed Zacchaeus that when the oracular responses foretold the future with truth and accuracy, they were a great boon to those who sought their guidance at pagan shrines. But the Christian Zacchaeus calmly called his friend's attention to the deceptive character of pagan oracles. The marvels which pagan deities were thought to work, whether genuine marvels or false, were actually contrivances of demons (*omnia figmenta sunt daemonum*). Demons were ubiquitous and wiser than men, for their creation was of loftier origin and their sense not limited by an earthly body. Their apparent divination (*divinandi simulatus*) was in any event earth-bound, for they could foresee no act of God before it was done. Zacchaeus then asked his straw man philosopher with obvious contempt whether it was not shameful to subscribe to the worship of such demons as though they were truly Gods (*cultus verae divinitatis*), and to commit to them the life and hope of man. The Christian ridicules image-worship: the more skillful the craftsman who made him, the holier the God, and the prettier the picture, the brighter the godhead (*divinitas clarior, pictura si pulchrior*). This was but the grossest demonology, and while demons stood in awe of Christians, they could lord it over pagans.[39]

Apollonius, who had preserved a respectful silence during this tirade, acknowledged that the Christian's charge had an appearance of truth, but he added that it could be refuted, if they might review the question. Pagans did make obeisance (*adorare*) to the *simulacra* and *imagines* of those who they believed were Gods by the truth of pagan doctrine (*vera religio*) or who they knew for certain were Gods, guided as they were in this by ancient tradition (*antiquorum traditiones*). But as for Christians, since they claimed this practice was an abomination to them, Apollonius wished to know why they too did homage (*venerari*) to images of mere human beings, whether wax-colored or fashioned in metals, alleging that this was but a show of respect for the sovereigns (*sub regum*

---

[39] *Consultat.*, I, 27 (Morin, pp. 33-34).

reverentia). Why did Christians, to use their own expression, accord to human beings the worship (*honor*) due to God alone? If this was wrong and contrary to law, why did Christians do it? Why did not the Christian priests forbid them to do it? Christians could not then take refuge in the pretext of duty when they were consciously guilty of the very abomination which they declared pagans committed in ignorance. Apollonius wished to know how Emperor-worship was reconcilable with Christianity since he had apparently observed Christians according cultus to imperial effigies.

Zacchaeus answered that he could not accept the pagan's charge of virtual Emperor-worship. The words of God were clear enough: Christians were not allowed to worship (*adorare*) the elements, nor angels, nor the powers of heaven and earth and air. To the Christian the word " worship " connoted duty and devotion to God (*divini enim speciale hoc nomen officii est*) while the Christian's reverence (*reverentia*) exceeded all earthly homage (*terrena veneratio*). The Christian used words paralleled in imperial cult usage, but he gave them different meanings. It was adulation (*adulatio*) that first drove men into the evil practice of Emperor-worship; custom (*consuetudo)* inured them to the continual performance of such rites, and so they have not been recalled from their error. Pagans might well reproach certain Christians with an ill-advised obsequiousness, Zacchaeus admitted, but not with actual worship of the Emperor as a God (*divinus cultus*). Joy was intense when the beloved faces of the Emperors were seen, and some Christians went farther than perhaps the Emperors, to whom this token of esteem was paid, really required—farther, in fact, than Christians ought to have gone. Although austere Christians abhorred this custom of ill-advised obsequiousness (*haec incautioris obsequii consuetudo*), the priests did not forbid the custom; nevertheless the Emperor whose effigy thus received the ritual salutation (*salutari*) was not called God, nor were his images worshipped with sacrificial incense (*nec adolentur ture imagines*), nor were such images placed upon the altars to receive cultus (*aut colendae aris superstant*). The images of the Emperor were rather set up as a memorial for their services, so as to furnish Emperors of the future with examples worthy of imitation or to censure Emperors of the present for their misdeeds. Apollonius could thus perceive that there was nothing in all this like the errors of his fellow pagans, for the performance of duties in an ill-considered manner (*officia incautiora*) was not properly to be compared with profane rites (*profani actus*). Even the Emperors to whom this practice related either said they did not want such rites to be performed, if they were consulted, or else they were merely reluctant to abandon any empty glory that had become customary. Still the Emperors made no rash claim to divinity, and they acknowledged they were mortals and unworthy to be worshipped as God, to whom they owed the very fact that they were Emperors. It was perhaps because of their faith that they deserved to be Emperors.[40]

This superb rationalization, however, did not suffice for many Christians, who still objected, as the author of the *Consultationes* himself apparently did, to this "ill-advised" and half idolatrous homage paid to imperial images (especially upon their dedication). Although the custom continued, as the discussion by Procopius of Gaza and the references in Anastatius of Antioch and John of Damascus prove, it met with determined opposition. A law of Theodosius II, for example, issued in 425 A. D., condemned the *adoratio* of imperial statues or images (*statuae vel imagines*) upon their erection, whether on holidays or week days, and provided for the presence of a *iudex* to spare the dignity of the occasion and the memory of the Emperor the dishonor of idolatry. Imperial portraits (*simulacra*) exhibited at public games were merely intended to indicate that the imperial presence (*numen!*) and praise (*laudes*) lived in the hearts and minds of those assembled. But worship that goes beyond the dignity of man should be reserved for God alone (*supernum numen!*).[41]

---

[40] *Ibid.*, I, 28 (Morin, pp. 34-35).

[41] *C. Th.*, XV, 4, 1 (Mommsen, 818-819).

CHAPTER IX

EPILOGUE

We have observed, and I have traced as well as I could in the complex and bewildering diversity of patristic thought and statement, the attitude of fourth century ecclesiastical writers towards the several Emperors and, when these writers saw the issues clearly enough to pass beyond the specific to the general, towards the Emperor as such. We saw that in the time of Constantine, being without precedent to guide them and intoxicated by the novelty of a Christian Emperor, the Fathers were by and large prone to accept his decision even in the settlement of doctrinal disputes. But the effort of Constantius to control, largely for political purposes I think, even the theology of the Church made it necessary to define and set limits to the authority of the Emperor, lest his interference do irreparable damage to the Church, which as the instrument of human salvation was seen to require independence of the dictates and expediencies of imperial statecraft. The struggle between *sacerdotium* and *imperium* really began with the mutual usurpations of Athanasius and Constantius. If Athanasius could tax Constantius with unwarranted interference in the affairs of the Church in violation of the tradition (*paradosis*) of the Apostolic Fathers and the canons of the oecumenical Councils, Constantius for his part could view with justifiable alarm the episcopal Empire which Athanasius came to control in Egypt. It is not difficult to understand the reasons for Constantius's erastian ambitions.

Few contemporaries of Eusebius could have envisaged another pagan Emperor. Julian, however, did repudiate Christianity, and although he might seem like an offspring of the gods to Libanius, he was execrated by Christians like Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and the author of the Pseudo-Basilian correspondence. Julian presented a very grave problem, and had he lived longer, it would have been necessary forthwith to set further limitations to the possibility of imperial caprice causing havoc in the affairs of the Christian Church. As it was, the Fathers fell back upon the Socratic distinction between true kingship and tyranny. Thus to Gregory Nazianzen, Julian was rather a tyrant than a true Emperor. But as the fourth century drew to a close, we saw St. Ambrose impose still further limitations upon the Emperor's authority in religious matters. Ambrose was found to suggest that in secular matters also the Emperor should be restrained from the too free exercise of his authority by the principles of justice and of propriety. We have found scant difference between the attitudes of the eastern and western episcopacies towards the Emperor, and the views of Ambrose concerning the *imperium* are virtually the same as those set forth by St. John Chrysostom.

The statement is made by Dr. F. Homes Dudden in discussing Flavian's attitude towards Theodosius in the interview granted the Bishop after the Antiochene sedition that while the latter was a courageous man, " in the Emperor's presence, he showed an exaggerated deference, even a servility of demeanour, such as the typical Oriental is accustomed to exhibit when face to face with an absolute potentate." The discretion and adroitness of a courtier are contrasted in Flavian with the imperiousness and the tone of authority assumed by Ambrose in the imperial presence.[1] But we have seen that Ambrose could play the courtier and be the statesman, too, in his relations with the several Emperors with whom he had personal contact. Comparison should be made, however, not between Flavian and Ambrose, but rather between Ambrose and Chrysostom. Both Ambrose and Chrysostom found themselves opposed by Empresses whom they rather indelicately ranked with Jezebel and Herodias. Both stood their ground and refused to compromise. Despite a certain *amour propre* that seems to mark the character of Chrysostom, his opposition to Eudoxia seems to me in many ways more admirable than Ambrose's stand against the Arian

---

[1] Dudden, *St. Ambrose*, I (1935), p. 370. *Cf.* W. R. W. Stephens, *Saint Chrysostom* (1872), p. 181.

Empress Justina. Chrysostom's position was rendered doubly difficult by powerful enemies within the Church, men like Theophilus of Alexandria and Severian of Gabala, and the Empress Eudoxia was orthodox as well as beloved by the populace, whereas the orthodox Milanese populace rallied to Ambrose's support in such numbers that the Arian court party found contest with him fraught with great danger to themselves.

The irresponsible Gratian, the usurping Maximus, the petulant Valentinian II, the bewildered Eugenius—these were the Emperors whom Ambrose met in the West until the appearance of Theodosius, and they had not contributed very much to the imperial dignity. When Ambrose first encountered Theodosius, moreover, the latter had but freshly arrived in the West, which within recent years had produced two dangerous usurpers whom he had quelled only with difficulty. Theodosius had to go slowly. The courage of Ambrose is certainly not to be denied. I doubt, however, the soundness of the contrast between "that strong and defiant Western Church which again and again in the course of its history has forced sovereigns to bow before it" and "the flattering subservience of Eastern prelates." [2]

In the *Homilies on the Statues* Chrysostom showed no more regard for the Emperor's exalted station than did St. Ambrose. Whereas the latter declared that "the Emperor is within the Church, not above the Church," Chrysostom was no more conciliatory when he insisted that the Bishop is greater than the Emperor, "for the sacred laws take and place under his hands even the imperial head, and when there is need of any good thing from above, the Emperor is wont to resort to the priest, but not the priest to the Emperor." Arcadius was not an imposing figure, it is true, but the Constantinopolitan court was a formidable enemy. Chrysostom fought against the licentiousness of the court with great courage and paid for his opposition with the exile that killed him, and in his failure, as we have noted, may lie the chief cause of later Byzantine caesaropapism.

---

[2] Dudden, I (1935), p. 370.

If Eusebius be thought to have held an unduly high opinion of the imperial person and office in his relations with Constantine, it remains to be shown that his western contemporaries were any different. The little available evidence seems to indicate that they were tarred with the same stick. Whether the tone of Synesius's address to Arcadius was in any way inspired by the attitude of Athanasius and his fellows in the East or of Ambrose in the West towards the Emperors whom they challenged is very doubtful; at any rate he claimed—untruly—that his audacious performance was without precedent among the Greeks. His purpose was different from that of Athanasius, Ambrose, or Chrysostom. He was interested in army reform, taxation, and the like, but the Fathers seldom addressed the Emperors on these matters in the fourth century. We do have, however, the appeals of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyprus in the fifth century, to the Empress Pulcheria to remedy the economic and administrative ills that were weighing upon his island see. We may note in passing that here was another eastern Bishop who was respectful before the imperial power, but who did not fawn before it and who preserved his dignity.

Ambrose can hardly be considered representative of the western episcopate. Sulpicius Severus's scathing estimate of the Bishops at Maximus's court in Gaul was noted in the chapter on St. Ambrose. Leo the Great and Gregory the Great, as their titles suggest, loom up as the stalwart champions of the western episcopate at the end of the Empire and the beginning of the Middle Ages. One finds, however, enough courtly fawning in the letters of Leo to the imperial family in the East to put him easily in the class of Flavian,[3] and the miserable paeans of praise in the letters of Gregory to the Emperor Phocas, after the latter had murdered Maurice to win his way to the throne, do small credit either to him or to the western episcopate.[4] Whereas the attitudes of Athanasius and Hilary of Poitiers towards the Emperor and his office were found to be about the same, to the eastern Bishop must go the credit for having begun the reaction against an *imperium* that threatened to engulf the *sacerdotium*.

---

[3] The following letters, numbered after *PL* 54 (1846), were addressed by Leo the Great to Emperors and members of the imperial family: *Epp.* 24 (*PL* 54, 735-736), 29-31 (781-796), 37 (811-812), 43-45 (821-835), 54 (855-856), 60 (873-874), 69-70 (890-895), 78-79 (907-912), 82-84 (917-922), 89-90 (930-934), 94-95 (941-944), 104-105 (91-1002), 111-112 (1019-1024), 115-116 (1031-1037), 121 (1055-1058), 123 (1060-1061), 126 (1069-1070),

There was abundant flattery of Emperors among ecclesiastics in the West as well as in the East, while episcopal opposition to Emperors is to be found in the East as well as in the West. Western defiance and eastern servility as characteristic of the episcopal attitude towards the Emperor are in the fourth century at any rate rhetorical unrealities.

The extent of a Father's deference or opposition to the Emperor, as we have had occasion more than once to observe in the course of this study, depended to a considerable extent upon the nature of the discourse in which he gave expression to his opinions. Thus in direct addresses to the Emperor both Athanasius and Hilary of Poitiers concealed the hostility to which they gave vent in works which presumably would never come into the Emperor's hands. We might go farther and note in connection with the Fathers the various types of address recognized by the rhetoricians of the imperial period, and we may expect praise or censure of the Emperor depending upon the type and purpose of the address. Most of the Church Fathers of the fourth century had been trained in the schools of classical rhetoric, and their addresses to the Emperor usually fall into certain rather definite categories of epideictic literature. Discourses intended for the express purpose of praising the Em-

---

128 (1073-1074), 130 (1078-1080), 134 (1094-1096), 136-137 (1098-1101), 145 (1113-1115), 148 (1117-1118), 156 (1127-1132), 162 (1143-1146), 164 (1148-1152), 165 (1155-1173), 169 (1212-1214). *Cf. Ep.* 46 (837-839).

[4] Gregory, *Epp.*, XIII, 34, 41 (Ewald and Hartmann, *MGH, Epp. tom.* II, pp. 397, 403-404); *cf. ibid.*, XIII, 42 (pp. 404-405). The letters are printed with different numbering (*Epp.*, XIII, 31, 38, 39 respectively) in *PL* 77.

peror (*logoi basilikoi*) were not infrequently composed by the Fathers; in this connection it will suffice to recall the speech *De laudibus Constantini* of Eusebius. Imperial birthdays and anniversaries were made the occasions of special orations (*genethliakoi*); the speech delivered at Trèves by the unknown panegyrist whose attitude towards Maximian Herculius we considered in the Introduction is of this type, as well as the oration of Chrysostom on the fourth anniversary of Theodosius the Great which we considered in the chapter on Chrysostom.

Lament for the death of a ruler with emphasis upon his or her elevation from the Empire on earth (*βασιλεία γηΐνη*) to that in heaven (*ἡ οὐράνιος*),[5] together with great praise of his or her ancestry, accomplishments, and character, marks imperial funeral orations *(paramythetikoi, monodiai, epitaphioi)*. Orations of an encomiastic nature were also composed in welcome of a ruler (*prosphonetikoi*) like the address with which Libanius (*Orat.* XIII) greeted Julian upon the latter's arrival in Antioch. Speeches delivered at the presentation of a crown (*stephanotikoi*) and ambassadors' speeches like that of Synesius (*presbeutikoi*) generally contained considerable praise of the ruler as well as some statement of the purpose of the presentation or reasons why the embassy was undertaken. Much early Christian apologetic literature would seem to fall in the latter category; Athenagoras's apology to Marcus Aurelius, for example, bears the suggestive title *Legatio pro Christianis* (*πρεσβεία περὶ Χριστιανῶν*).[6]

In the middle of the fifth century the Empire in the West ceased to be, and despite the fiction of its Frankish revival its ancient form was gone forever. But the Empire in the East survived, despite all changes, with a great measure of ancient culture, and with it survived notwithstanding the strength of Byzantine erastianism the tradition of Athanasius and Chrysostom. In the eighth century, for example, during the struggle with the iconoclastic Emperors Leo III the Isaurian and his son Constantine V Copronymus the tendency of Athanasius and Chrysostom to limit the authority of the Emperor in ecclesiastical affairs finds strong reflection in St. John of Damascus, who says that it is not for Emperors to dictate laws to the Church (*οὐ βασιλέων ἐστὶ νομοθετεῖν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*). The concern of Emperors is the just administration of the State; the government of the Church is the duty of its pastors and its teachers.[7] "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, unto God the things that are God's." [8]

---

[5] Gregory of Nyssa, *Orat. funebr. de Placilla Imp.* (*PG* 46, 889C).

[6] These various types of epideictic *logoi* are analyzed in the late third century A. D. manual of Menander Rhetor, *Peri epideiktikon* (Spengel, *Rhet. gr.*, III (1856), pp. 368-446).

---

[7] John of Damascus, *De imaginibus orat. II*, 12 (*PG* 94, 1296CD).

[8] *Ibid., orat. II*, 12 (*PG* 94, 1297A); *orat. III*, 11 (1333C); *orat. III*, 41 (1357A).

SELECT LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ABRIDGED TITLES

Acta sanctorum	*Acta sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur vel a catholicis scriptoribus celebrantur,* quae ex latinis et graecis aliarumque gentium antiquis monumentis collegit, digessit, notis illustravit Ioannes Bollandus, Godefridus Henschenius et al., 65 vols., Antwerp, 1643-1931.
Anal. Bolland.	*Analecta Bollandiana,* Paris and Brussels, 1882 *et sqq.*
Bekker-Naber	*Flavii Iosephi opera omnia.* Post Immanuelem Bekkerum recognovit Samuel A. Naber, 6 vols., Leipzig, 1888-1896.
Catal.	*Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum.* Eds. F. Boll, F. Cumont, G. Kroll, A. Olivieri et al., vols. I-XI, Brussels, 1898-1934.
CIL	*Corpus inscriptionum latinarum,* consilio et auctoritate Academiae litterarum regiae Borussicae editum, 15 vols. in 38, Berlin, 1863-1909.
Coll. Avellan.	*Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab a. CCCLVII usque ad a. DLIII datae* Avellana *quae dicitur* collectio. Rec. O. Guenther, *CSEL* 35-36, 1895, 1898.
C. Th.	*Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis et leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes* . . . Eds. Th. Mommsen et P. M. Meyer, 2 vols., Berlin, 1905.
CSEL	*Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum.* Editum consilio et impensis Academiae litterarum caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna, 1866 *et sqq.*
D. C. B.	*A Dictionary of Christian Biography,* eds. Wm. Smith and H. Wace, 4 vols., London, 1877-1887.
Dittenberger, *Sylloge*^{3}	*Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum,* a Guilelmo Dittenbergero condita et aucta, nunc tertium edita . . . F. H. von Gaertringen, 4 vols., Leipzig, 1915-1924.
Florileg. patr.	*Florilegium patristicum tam veteris quam medii aevi auctores complectens,* Bonn, fascs. 1-12, 1904-1919; nova series, fascs. 13 *et sqq.,* 1921 *et sqq.*
GCS	*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte.* Herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter-Commission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Leipzig, 1897 *et sqq.*

H. E.	*Historia ecclesiastica* (Eusebius, Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret).
Mansi, *SS. conc. coll.*	*Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* . . . Eds. J. D. Mansi et al., vols. I-VIII (include conciliar canons through the fifth century), Florence and Venice, 1759-1762.
Math.	*I. Firmici Materni Matheseos libri VIII.* Eds. W. Kroll et F. Skutsch, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1897-1913.
MGH, Auct. antiquiss.	*Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores antiquissimi*, 15 vols., Berlin, 1877-1919.
MGH, Epp.	*Epistolae*, vols. I-II (*Gregorii I Papae registrum epistolarum*), 1887-1899.
Mommsen, *Chron. min.*	*Chronica minora saeculorum IV. V. VI. VII.*, ed. Th. Mommsen, *MGH, Auct. antiquiss.*, vols. IX, 1892; XI, 1894; XIII, 1898.
NPNF	*A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, eds. P. Schaff and H. Wace. Series I, 14 vols., New York, 1886-1890; series II, 14 vols., 1890-1900.
PG	*Patrologiae graecae cursus completus* . . . Ed. J. P. Migne, 161 vols., Paris, 1857 *et sqq.*
PL	*Patrologiae latinae cursus completus* . . . Ed. J. P. Migne, 221 vols., Paris, 1844 *et sqq.* (The references to *PL* 16 are to the edition of 1866, the pagination of which is entirely different from that of the edition of 1845.)
PW	*Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, begonnen von Georg Wissowa . . . herausgegeben von Wilhelm Kroll, Halbband 1-38; 2. Reihe, Halbband 1-12; Stuttgart, 1894-1939.
Savile	*S. Ioannis Chrysostomi opera omnia*, ed. Henry Savile, 8 vols., Eton, 1612.
Seeck, *Untergang*	Seeck, Otto, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, 6 vols. in 12, Stuttgart, 1920-1923.
Texte u. Untersuchungen	*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, herausgegeben von Oscar von Gebhardt und Adolf Harnack, Leipzig, 1883-1897; neue Folge, 1897 *et sqq.*
Texts and Studies	*Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature*, ed. J. Armitage Robinson, 9 vols., Cambridge, 1891 *et sqq.*
Tillemont, *Mémoires*	Tillemont, Louis Sébastien Le Nain de, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclesiastique des six premiers siécles*, 16 vols., Paris, 1701-1714.

GENERAL INDEX

References to the historians Eusebius, Palladius, Philostorgius, Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Zosimus appear in footnotes throughout the book, but their names are given in the Index only when they are found in the text or their testimony is of particular value or interest.

Abel, 168
Abenner, King, 33 (n. 67)
Abraham, 176
Acacius of Beroea, enemy of Chrysostom, 169, 179, 183, 184
Acts, The, referred to, 17
Adam, 147, 168
Ad Constantium (so-called *Liber primus ad Constantium*), of Hilary of Poitiers, 98-99 (n. 100); analysis of attitude towards Emperor in, 98-100, 102, 103; resembles Athanasius' *Apologia ad Constantium,* 74, 99
Administrators of Jewish commonwealth, Jesus' attitude towards, 14
Adoration of Emperor, *see Proskynesis*
Aelius Aristides, 159, 162
Aemilia Liguria, Roman province in northern Italy, 109
Aequitas (*Augusti*), 22
Aeschylus, Greek tragic poet, 162
Aeternus imperator, used by St. Ambrose of God, 146, *cf.* 162
Aetius, Arian leader, 83
Africa, 54, 55 (n. 75)
Agamemnon, 161
Agathos daimon, of Alexandrians, 22
Ahab, Constantius compared to, 79; accosted by Elijah in vineyard of Naboth, 141
Alaric, 158
Alexander of Alexandria, 91
Alexandria, 77, 91, 102
Alexandrians, associate Nero with their *agathos daimon,* 21-22
Allard, Paul, 63 (n. 24)
Ambrose, St., Bishop of Milan, 13, 36; circumstances of consecration as Bishop, 109; opposition to Empress Justina's effort to secure a basilica in Milan for Arian worship, 109-14; asserts "Emperor is within the Church, not over the Church", 114, 115, 148; attitude of, towards Emperor contrasted with that of Symmachus, 115; admonished Valentinian II to refuse petition of Symmachus, 117; addressed works *De fide* and *De spiritu sancto* to Gratian, 117-18; and the affair of Callinicum, 118-23, 214; tactics of, in disputes with Emperors, 123-24; attitude of, towards Theodosius after massacre of Thessalonica, 124-30, 141; background of alleged expulsion of Theodosius I from church by, 125-26 (n. 71); funeral oration of, *De obitu Valentiniani,* 130-32; recognized Eugenius as Emperor, 132-34; afterwards regarded Eugenius as usurper, 134-35, 137-38; delivered funeral oration *De obitu Theodosii,* 136-38; held no brief for any political philosophy, 138; attitude of, towards imperial authority in *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucan,* 138-39; in *De apologia prophetae David,* 140, 142-44; in *In ps. XXXVII enarratio,* 141; embassies of, to the court of Maximus in Gaul, 140-41, 162; attitude of, towards Emperor in latter's relation to *lex,* 142-44; imperial titles of address in, 145-47; attitude towards Emperor of, contrasted with that of Optatus of Milevis, 148; like Athanasius, recognized imperial right to summon church councils, 148; called "tyrant" by secretary of Valentinian II, 148-50; apparent influence upon subsequent ecclesiastical history in West, 151; compared with Synesius of Cyrene, 161-62; compared with Chrysostom, 193, 213-15; on imperial images, 205, 213
Ammianus Marcellinus, historian, 116
Amos, Book of, referred to, 137 (n. 122)
Anastatius of Antioch, on imperial images, 202, 205 (n. 31), 211
Anastatius Sinaita, 180 (n. 62)
Anatolia, revolt of Tribigild and Gainas in, 158

Antichrist, Constantius referred to as, 79, 96, 101

Antigonus of Nicaea, 61

Antinous, favorite of Emperor Hadrian, 35, 67

Antioch, 25, 80; departure of Chrysostom from, 163; canons of Council of, violated by Chrysostom, 174 (n. 43), 181; Chrysostom's *Homilies on the Statues* delivered in, 189; sedition of, in 387 A. D., 189-90, 198

Antiochus of Ptolemais, enemy of Chrysostom, 169, 179, 183, 184

Antiphonal singing, introduced by St. Ambrose, 124

Antoninus Pius, Emperor, 19, 23; addressed by Marcianus Aristides, 33 (n. 67), 33-35, 68, 159

Anulinus, *vir clarissimus*, 31-32 (n. 62)

Apeleutheros, 18

Apollinaris, Claudius, of Hierapolis, Christian apologist, 32; addressed Marcus Aurelius, 36

Apologetic literature, Christian, addressed to Emperors, 32-39

Apologia ad Constantium Imperatorem, of Athanasius, 73-77, 78-79, 80; resembles the *Ad Constantium* of Hilary of Poitiers, 74, 99

Apologia de fuga, of Athanasius, 77, 80

Apostle, the thirteenth, Chrysostom so called by Empress Eudoxia, 173

Apostles, Church of the, in Constantinople, 174; place of burial of members of imperial family and Bishops of Constantinople, 186; Chrysostom's homily on fourth anniversary of death of Theodosius I delivered in, 188-89

Apotheosis of deceased Emperors implicitly rejected by Aristides,' 34; ridiculed by Athanasius, 34-35, 67-68

Aquileia, 88, 119; Council of, 148 (n. 166)

Arabissus, Chrysostom ordered to to take up abode in, 185

Arbogast, 130, 132, 133; regarded by St. Ambrose as "barbarian brigand", 135

Arcadius, Emperor, 25, 51, 97, 132, 136-37; address of Synesius of Cyrene to, 152-62; appears as *hiereus megas* in Synesius' allegorical history *On Providence*, 153; and St. John Chrysostom, 163-86; married Eudoxia, daughter of Bauto, 163; sermon of Chrysostom delivered at Drypia after departure of, 167-68; indignation of, aroused against Chrysostom by Empress, 169; authorizes process against Chrysostom at Synod of the Oak, 172; attacked by Chrysostom, 173; recalls Chrysostom from first exile, 173-74, 175 (n. 47); grants permission for silver statue of Eudoxia, 178; refuses to attend Christmas service in Santa Sophia (403 A. D.), 181; orders Chrysostom to "leave the church," 181-82; appeal of Acacius, Severian, Antiochus, and Cyrinus to, 183; banishes Chrysostom for second time, 184; letter of remonstrance from Emperor Honorius to, 185; buried in Church of the Apostles, 186

Archiereus, 18

Archontes, Byzantine magistrates, 61, 165, 200

Ares and Aphrodite, Julius Caesar offspring of, 19

Arianism, alleged, of Cyril of Jerusalem, 70 (n. 51)

Arians, influence of, at court of Constantius, 71; discourses of Athanasius against, 73; attitude of, towards Emperor, 12, 82-86; St. Ambrose and the demand for a Milanese basilica for the, 109-14, 149-50; sermons of Ambrose against, 117; Athanasians anxious to separate Constantius from cause of, 161; Chrysostom combats influence of, in Constantinople, 164

Ariminum (Rimini), Council of, letter to Constantius from Arian Bishops at, 84-85; letter to Constantius from orthodox Bishops at, 85

Aristides, Marcianus, Christian apologist, 32, 33-35, 36, 38, 39, 68

Aristo of Pella, alleged address of, to Emperor Hadrian, 33

Arius, 82, 91

Arles, Synod of, 88

Armenia, 37, 185

Arnobius, Christian apologist, 32, 33, 63

Asmus, J. R., 160 (n. 36)

Assyrians, 17

Asterius, Count of the East, removes

Chrysostom secretly from Antioch, 163

Astrologers, Astrology, and Julius Firmicus Maternus, 59-62

Athanasians, 54, 80, 87, 107-08, 161; *see also* Athanasius, Eusebius of Vercelli, Hilary of Poitiers, Liberius, Lucifer of Calaris; and Ariminum, Sardica, Councils of

Athanasius, St., of Alexandria, 71 ff., 78 ff.; 11, 12, 13, 17, 34, 35, 36, 40-41, 53, 54, 57, 111, 112, 148, 159, 162, 172, 194, 212, 215, 216, 217, 218; ridicules Emperor-worship in treatise *Contra gentes*, 67-68; comparisons of Emperor with God, 72-73, 199; *Apology* of, to Emperor Constantius, 73-77, 78-79; struggle with Constantius, 78 ff.; change in attitude of, towards Emperor, 78, 79-81; charges against Arians made by, 82-83; on imperial images, 198-99, 202

Athenagoras, Christian apologist, 32, 33; addressed Marcus Aurelius and Commodus in behalf of Christians, 36-39, 217

Athens, 33

Augur, 60

Augustine, St., Bishop of Hippo, 13, 31-32 (n. 62), 49 (n. 42), 54; panegyric of, in honor of Bauto and Emperor Valentinian I, 164

Augustus, Emperor, 35, 66, 197-98

Aurelian, Emperor, first official formulation of thesis that Emperors rule by divine right comes under, 25 (n. 28)

Aurelian, Consul in 400 A. D., 152, 153; leader of anti-German party in Constantinople, 158; Praetorian Prefect, 159

Aurelius Victor, quoted, 51 (n. 49)

Aurum coronarium, presented by Synesius of Cyrene to Emperor Arcadius, 152, 154

Ausonius, poet, 26, 62

Autocrat, Emperor supreme, of the world, 81

Auxentius of Milan, 82

Auxentius, Mercurinus, Arian Bishop, 111, 123, 124

Axelson, Bertil, 208 (n. 38)

Azariah, reproaches King Uzziah, 190-91

Babylas, St., Bishop of Antioch, and legend of Philip the Arabian (?), 126 (n. 71)

Babylonians, 17

Baehrens, E. and W., 26 (n. 32)

Barbarians, attitude of Synesius of Cyrene towards, 158, 161; of Themistius, 161; of Chrysostom, 168 (n. 16)

Barlaam and Josaphat, romance of, 33 (n. 67)

Baronius, Cesare, 94 (n. 54)

Basil the Great, of Caesarea, alleged letter of, to Emperor Julian, 106, 108, 212; on imperial images, 199, 201, 202

Basileus, defined by Clement of Alexandria, 144

Basilikai aretai, 47, *cf.* 49

Basilikoi (*logoi*), 159, 217

Basiliscus of Comana, St., Chrysostom buried in martyry of, 186

Baur, Dom Chrysostomus, 126 (n. 71), 163 (n. 1), 170 (n. 23), 175 (nn. 47, 48), 176 (n. 49), 180 (n. 62)

Bauto, Frankish general, father of Empress Eudoxia, 163; panegyric of St. Augustine in honor of, 164

Belshazzar, Emperor Constantius compared to, 79

Bidez, Joseph, 204 (n. 24)

Bishops, relations of, to Emperor at Nicaea and in decades following, 79-81; right of Emperor to appoint, 84; opposition of orthodox, to Constantius, 78-81, 86-103, to Julian, 103-07; effects upon Christian attitude towards *imperium*, 107-08; judge Emperors in matters pertaining to the faith, 80-81, 111; duty of, to castigate erring Emperors, 141; in religious disputes, judgment to be rendered only by, 144-45, 185; subservience of Gallican, to Emperor, 150-51; appeal of certain, to Arcadius and Eudoxia in behalf of Chrysostom, 182; declared by opponents of Chrysostom to be under imperial authority, 183; princes of more dignity than Emperors, 189-90, 191-92; entrusted with affairs of heaven, 192

Bithynia, 184

Blumenthal, Fritz, 21

Boissier, G., 63 (n. 22)

Bosphorus, 174, 186

Bréhier, Louis, 20 (n. 15)

Briso, court eunuch, 174
Britain, expedition of Emperor Constans to, 65
Burckhardt, J., 63 (n. 24)
Bury, J. B., 153 (n. 3)

Cadoux, C. J., 14 (n. 1)
Caesar and Christ, apparent rivals for devotion of mankind, 18-23
Caesarius, identified by Seeck as Typhos of Synesius' allegory *On Providence*, 153 (n. 7)
Caesaropapism, especially 40, 55-56, 86-88, 151, 212
Caesars, sons of Constantine I, 50, 52, 57, 59; *see* Constans, Constantine II, Constantius
Callinicum, city on Euphrates, affair of, 118-23
Carthage, 55, 56 (n. 78)
Cassius Dio, on imperial images in the precious metals, 197-98
Castricia, court lady, 169
Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum, 61
Cedrenus, George, 124 (n. 63)
Chalcedon, 172
Change in patristic attitude towards Emperor, in fourth century, 12, 54, 77, 78, 79-81, 86-88, 91-92, 103-04, 107-08, 147-51, 212-13
Charis, of Emperor, 21
Christ, *see* Jesus
Christ and Emperor, parallelism between, especially 47-48, 72-73, 194-95, 198-201, 205
Christian and imperial-cult language, parallelism between, 18-22
Christianity, interdependence of, upon Roman Empire, 35-36, 48-49
Christianos, 18
Chronicles, Second Book of, referred to, 190, 191
Chronicon Paschale, 33
Chrysostom, St. John, Patriarch of Constantinople, 163-95; 12, 126 (n. 71), 147, 151, 212, 213; defines nature of imperial rule, 25; derogatory references of, to Emperor Julian, 106-07; and the earthquake in 400 A. D. in Constantinople, 152 (n. 2); consecrated Patriarch, 163; early relations of, with Empress Eudoxia, 164; sermons of, delivered at Drypia in presence of Eudoxia, 164-68; social gospel of, 168, 169; early attitude of, towards Eudoxia, 168; reproaches Eudoxia for depriving widow of Theognostus of her vineyard, 168-69, 191; enemies of, 169-70; at odds with St. Epiphanius of Cyprus, 170; discourse of, on vices of women thought to be attack on Eudoxia, 170-71; delivers sermon on wretchedness of imperial household, 171; provokes Empress by determining not to proceed against Theophilus of Alexandria in affair of Nitrian monks, 171-72; first deposition of, contrived by Eudoxia and Theophilus of Alexandria, 172; preaches two sermons on day after the deposition, 172-73; compares Empress to Jezebel and Herodias, 173, 177, 179-80; withdraws to Praenetus in Bithynia, but is recalled, 173-74; re-occupies cathedra and preaches to eager multitude, 174-75; thereby violates 4th and 12th canons of Council of Antioch, 174 (n. 43), 181; genuineness of discourse preserved at end of Pseudo-George of Alexandria's *Vita Chrysostomi*, 175 (and nn. 47-49); praises Eudoxia extravagantly upon return from the first exile, 176-78; and the affair of the silver statue of Eudoxia, 178-79; attacks Eudoxia again, 179-80; events leading up to and including the second exile of, 180-85; refuses to leave church when ordered to do so by Arcadius, 182; protected by populace of capital, 183; receives decree of his second exile, 184; takes leave of his followers in Santa Sophia, 184; departs for second exile, 184; hardships of second exile and his death, 185-86; triumphant return of his body to capital, 186; buried near Eudoxia in Church of the Apostles, 186; letter of, to Eudoxia, 191; attitude of, towards imperial office, 187-95; view of Emperor in *Homilies on the Statues*, 189-90, 214; on imperial images, 196-97, 198, 200, 202; comparison of, with St. Ambrose, 213-15, 217-18
Church and State, problems of, 12, 35-36, 40-41, 48-49, 74, 79-81, 82, 86-88, 91-92, 95, 107-08, 110, 111-12, 114, 119, 123-24, 147-50, 151, 162, 183, 185, 189-90, 194-95, 212-18
Cicero, 67 (n. 40), 93
Cilicia, 185

Claudianus, poet, 62

Claudius, Emperor, 17 (n. 5)

Claudius Mamertinus, panegyrist, 42, 62; for his formerly alleged father of the same name, 26 (n. 32)

Clement of Alexandria, 32; defines *Basileus*, 144

Codex Iustinianus, 24 (n. 23); quoted, 25 (n. 28)

Codex Theodosianus, *numen* applied to Emperor in, 31 (n. 62); *divus* used of deceased Emperor in, 59 (n. 8); imperial constitutions against occult scientists in, 60

Coinage, character of, under Empire, 15; Jupiter and Hercules symbolize Diocletian and Maximian in, 28; Constans and Constantius urged by Firmicus to make, out of statues, etc., of pagan gods, 65; Constantine represented as engaged in prayer to God on his, 204

Coleman-Norton, P. R., 169 (n. 20)

Comana, in Pontus, Chrysostom died at, 186

Comes Orientis, in affair of Callinicum, 119, 122; Asterius, 163

Commodus, Emperor, 36, 37, 38

Concordia Augusti, 22

Consecratio divorum, 58-59

Consistorium, of Emperor, 111, 125, 127, 131

Constans, Emperor, 53, 54-55, 71, 88; address of Firmicus to (*De errore profanarum religionum*), 57, 62-67; expedition of, to Britain, 65; references of Athanasius to, 74, 75-76; references of Hosius of Cordova to, 76, 92

Constantia, Empress, letter of Eusebius of Caesarea to, 53

Constantia Augusti, 22

Constantine I, the Great, Emperor, 12, 31 (n. 62), 57, 70, 74, 82, 87, 212, 215; and attitude of Eusebius of Caesarea towards him, 40-44, 46-54; extravagant praise of, by Bishops at his *tricennalia*, 43; omniscience of, according to Eusebius, 48, 49; exemplar of true piety, 50; claimed to be Bishop ordained of God, 53, 91; relations of, with Bishops at Nicaea, 53-54; Donatists address petitions to, 55 (n. 75); references of Firmicus to, 58-59; disclaims any right of jurisdiction over Bishops, according to Rufinus of Aquileia, 144-45; Christian sacrifices to image of, 204; and images and portraits of himself, 204-05

Constantine II, Emperor, 57

Constantine V Copronymus, iconoclastic Emperor, 218

Constantinople, Eusebius of Caesarea's panegyric on Constantine delivered at, 46; Arian activity at court of, 71; *Ad Constantium* of Hilary of Poitiers written in, 99; historian Sozomen lived and wrote in, 126 (n. 71); three years residence of Synesius of Cyrene in, 152-53; Thebes stands for, in Synesius' work *On Providence*, 153; Chrysostom consecrated Patriarch of, 163, 164; translation of relics of the martyr Phocas from Pontus to, 164-65; Gothic leader Gainas in occupation of, 169; pleasures of, attractive to fashionable churchmen, 169; Theophilus of Alexandria unwilling to return to, 180-81; Chrysostom in exile supplied with funds by friends in, 185; Chrysostom's homily on fourth anniversary of death of Theodosius delivered in, 188-89; Bishop Flavian goes to, to intercede with Theodosius after sedition of Antioch, 189

Constantius, Emperor, 12, 31 (n. 61), 40, 49, 53, 54, 72, 107, 148, 159, 160, 161, 212; address of Firmicus to (*De errore profanarum religionum*), 57, 62-67; letter of Cyril of Jerusalem to, 68-70; and the Council of Sardica, 71; *Apology* of Athanasius to, 73-77, 78-79, 80; called "Eternal Emperor" by the Arians, 82, 85; attitude of, towards Church, 86-88; and Pope Liberius, 88-89; and Eusebius of Vercelli, 90; and Hosius of Cordova, 90-92; and Lucifer of Calaris, 92-97; and Hilary of Poitiers, 98-103; praised by Gregory Nazianzen, 104-05; called *divus* in memorial of Symmachus, 115

Constantius Chlorus, father of Constantine I, addressed by panegyrist, 46; no persecution in Gaul under, 55 (n. 75); referred to as *divus* by Firmicus, 58

Constitutiones, against occult scientists in Theodosian Code, 60

Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii, anonymous 4th century Christian dialogue, alleged Firmican authorship of, 207-08 (n. 38); discussion of worship and adoration of imperial images in, 207-11
Contra Constantium, of Hilary of Poitiers, resembles Athanasius' *Historia Arianorum*, 99, 100; analysis of attitude towards Emperor in, 100-03
Contra gentes, of Athanasius, 67-68
Conversion to Christianity, of Emperors, hardly thought possible in N. T. times, 17; of Firmicus Maternus, 58, 66
Corinth, 16
Corinthians, First Epistle to, referred to, 20
Costyllius, contemptuous diminutive of Constantius, 79
Councils, church, right of Emperor to summon, 53, 89, 148
Cucusus, near border of Cilicia and Armenia Secunda, Chrysostom exiled to, 184, 185
Cults, unofficial municipal, organized in Egypt to worship living Emperor, 22
Cyprus, 170
Cyrene, 152, 154
Cyril of Jerusalem, St., 36, 71, 162, 168; letter of, to Constantius, 68-70; on imperial images, 199-200
Cyrinus of Chalcedon, enemy of Chrysostom, 183, 184

Daniel, St. Jerome's attitude towards worship or adoration of Emperor's image in commentary on, 206
Darius, Persian King, referred to by Synesius of Cyrene, 155
David, 122, 128, 190 (n. 93); spares Saul's life, 140, 192; his relation as a King to *lex* (St. Ambrose), 142-44; referred to by Chrysostom, 173
Decius, Emperor, 101
De errore profanarum religionum, of Julius Firmicus Maternus, 57, 62-67, 68
Deissmann, Adolf, 15, 18-19 (n. 7)
Delacroix, G., 69 (n. 45), 70 (n. 51)
De laudibus Constantini, of Eusebius of Caesarea, 41-42; analysis of, 46-51, 53, 217
Delehaye, H., 66 (n. 39)
Demons and Demonology, 38-39, 50, 192, 203, 209
De mortibus persecutorum, of Lactantius, and the Emperors, 44-46
De Rossi, Christian inscriptions, 59 (nn. 7, 8)
Despotes, title, 20, 70 (n. 50), 82, 85
De synodis, of Athanasius, 84
Diadem, worn by Emperor alone, 187; a symbol less noble than the cross, 188
Diakonos, 18
Digest, Ulpian quoted, 24
Dio Chrysostom, 159; Synesius' model in composition of address *On Kingship*, 160
Diocletian, Emperor, restorer with Maximian of Roman Empire, 27; earthly counterpart of Jupiter, 28; persecuted Christians, 40; career and death of, according to Lactantius, 45; etiquette of addressing Emperors from time of, 63
Dionysius of Milan, 103
Dittenberger, W., 19 (n. 9)
Diviners, 60
Divinity of Emperor, asserted by panegyrists, 27, 29, 63, 74; by Firmicus, 59-62; ridiculed by Athanasius, 67-68
Divus, used of deceased Emperors, 31; applied by Firmicus to Constantius Chlorus, 58; used in Christian funerary inscriptions, 58-59; in Theodosian and Justinianean Codes, 59 (n. 8); frequently used by Symmachus, 115, *cf.* 116 (n. 27); *see also* Titles of Emperor
Domitian, Emperor, 19, 35
Donatists, attitude of St. Optatus of Milevis towards, 54-56; addressed petitions to Constantine I, 55 (n. 75); attitude of, towards Emperor, 82
Donatus, 43; attitude of, towards Emperor, 55-56
Doulos, 18, 50, 189, 190, 191
Dragons, embroidered on Emperor's vestments, 187
Drypia, sermons of Chrysostom delivered at, 164-68
Du Cange, Chas., 178 (n. 53), 185 (n. 73), 186 (n. 78)
Dudden, F. H., 119 (n. 41), 125 (n. 71), 212-13

Earthquake, in Constantinople in 400 A. D., 152
Easter Eve, of 404 A. D., 182, 182-83 (n. 67)

Ecclesiastical History, see Historia ecclesiastica

Egypt, 17, 212; unofficial municipal cults of living Emperor in, 22; stands for Roman Empire in Synesius' allegory *On Providence*, 153

Egyptians, 17; Secundus and Theonas, Arian Bishops, 82

Eikon, of Emperor on coin given to Jesus, 15; Empress Constantia rebuked by Eusebius of Caesarea for wishing an, of Christ, 53; *see* Images of Emperor

Eleutheropolis, in Palestine, 93, 98

Elijah, 147, 173, 179-80; accosts King Ahab in vineyard of Naboth, 141

Emperor, method of investigating patristic attitude towards, 11-14; Jesus' attitude towards, 14-15; N. T. attitude towards, 15-17, *cf.* 17-21; Hellenistic background of worship of, 17-23; pagan and Christian views of ultimate basis of authority of, 23-26, *cf.* 138-39; pagan panegyrics addressed to, 26-31, 74; Christian apologies addressed to, 32-39; position of, in thought of Eusebius of Caesarea, 40-42, 43-44, 46-51, 53-54; attitude of Lactantius towards, 44-46; of Optatus of Milevis, 43, 54-56; of Donatus and Donatists, 43, 55-56, 82; right of, to summon church councils, 53, 89, 148; extreme deference shown to, in generation after Constantine, 57; in thought of Firmicus Maternus, 57-66; personified the Empire, 63; duty of, to preserve integrity of the faith, 64; pagan background of sanctity of, 66-67; worship of, attacked by Athanasius in *Contra gentes*, 67-68; extreme deference shown by Cyril of Jerusalem to, 68-70; attitude of orthodox Bishops at Council of Sardica towards, 71; of Athanasius in works of his earlier career (*Epistula encyclica ad episcopos, Contra gentes, De incarnatione verbi, Orationes contra Arianos, Apologia ad Constantium Imperatorem, Apologia de fuga*), 71-77; Athanasius's later attitude towards, 78-81; judgments of Church never received validity from, 80-81, 111; apparent Arian attitude towards, 82-86; right of, to appoint Bishops, 84; pressure of, upon Athanasians, 86-88; attitude of Liberius towards, 88-89; of Eusebius of Vercelli, 90; of Hosius of Cordova, 90-92; of Lucifer of Calaris, 92-97; of Luciferians, 97-98; of Hilary of Poitiers, 98-103; of Gregory Nazianzen towards (Julian), 104-06; of Pseudo-Basil, 106; of St. John Chrysostom, 106-07; character of office of, and rightful possession thereof by, 107; effects of attacks of Athanasians upon office of, 107-108; career and works of St. Ambrose in relation to, 109-51; Ambrose's struggle with, concerning a basilica for Arians in Milan, 109-14, 123-24, 149-50; cannot lawfully seize property of a private citizen, 110; in a cause involving the faith, to be judged by Bishops, 111, *cf.* 80-81; pagan view of, as "living law", 26, 112; "is within the Church, not above the Church", 114, 115, 148, *cf.* 185, 189-90; petition of pagan party (Symmachus) to, for restoration of altar of Victory to Roman Curia, 115, 117, 132, 134, 146; and genius of the Empire (*genius publicus*), 116; theological works of Ambrose and Eusebius of Caesarea for instruction of, 117-18; Ambrose, affair of Callinicum, and, 118-23; good Emperor contrasted with bad, 120, 193; Ambrose, massacre of Thessalonica, and, 124-30, 141; not above commandments, 129-30; Ambrose's funeral oration on Valentinian II, 130-32; on Theodosius I, 136-38; and the problem of usurpation, 107, 133-34, 135, 137-38, 139, 140-41; Ambrose and Augustine hold no brief for government of, 138; power of, ordained of God, 138-39, 191-92, 194; duty of priest to castigate guilty, 141; and law, man-made and natural, in thought of Ambrose, 142-44, *cf.* 25, 193-94; in Clement of Alexandria, 144; attitude of Rufinus of Aquileia towards, 144-45; tendency to deprecate power of, 145, 195; language of Ambrose in addressing, 145-47; relation of, to Church, 147-48; "tyranny" of Ambrose over, 148-50; subservience of Gallican episcopacy to, 150-51; and Synesius of Cyrene, 152-62; *hiereus megas* in Synesius' allegory *On Providence*, 153; boldness of Synesius in presence of, 154; summary and analysis of Synesius' address to, *On Kingship*, 154-61; comparison of attitudes of Synesius and Ambrose towards, 161-62; relations of St. John Chrysostom with court of, 163-186; Chrysostom's low opinion of dignity of, 171; expels Chrysostom from Santa Sophia, 181-82; declared to have authority over Bishops, 183; should submit to episcopal judgment in religious disputes, 185; final triumph of Chrysostom over, 186; Chrysostom's view of office of, 187-95; characterized by gold and purple, 187; established titulature followed when addressing, 188; at the circus games, 188; "has not an equal in dignity upon earth", 189; of less dignity than priest, 189-90, 191; justice should be peculiar property of, 143-44, 191; function of, only to exercise control over earthly things, 191-92; should establish rule over himself, 159, 193; and law, man-made and natural, in thought of Chrysostom, 25, 193-94, *cf.* 142-44; compared by Chrysostom with God, 194-95; miserable end of, 195; Fathers' attention to images of, to illustrate religious teaching and theological discussion, 196-211; adoration (*proskynesis*) and worship (*latreia*) of, 13, 23, 24, 27, 29, 197, 198-99, 200, 202-11; reasons for erastianism of Constantius, 212; attitude towards, in fourth century much the same in both East and West, 212-16; various types of patristic addresses to, 216-17; persistence of episcopal opposition to, in the East, 217-18; *see also* under the names of the various Emperors and Fathers, Church and State, "Render unto Caesar", and Titles of Emperor

Empire, in heaven, and Empire on earth, 48, 87, 156, 217; *see also* Christ and Emperor

En-gedi, David spares Saul's life at, 140

Engelbrecht, A., 31 (n. 61) 146 (nn. 149-50, 152-53)

Ephesus, inscriptions from, 19; reference to Chrysostom's deposition of Bishops at Council of, 171-72

Ephraim of Edessa, St., Syriac sermon of, adapted by Chrysostom, 180

Epideictic literature, types of, addressed to Emperor, 216-17

Epiphaneia, 18

Epiphanius of Cyprus, St., 126 (n. 71); investigates Nitrian monks, 170; at odds with Chrysostom, 170; shown great deference by Empress Eudoxia, 170

Episcopacy, *see* Bishops

Epistle to Diognetus, referred to, 32

Epitaphioi (*logoi*), 217

Epithets, used of Emperors, *see* Titles

Equuleus, instrument of torture, 101

Erastianism, imperial, *see* Caesaropapism

Eudoxia, Empress, wife of Arcadius, 126 (n. 71), 163-86, 213-14; Frankish general Bauto father of, 163; Philostorgius' description of, 164; early relations of, with St. John Chrysostom, 164; sermons of Chrysostom at Drypia in presence of, 164-68; early attitude of Chrysostom towards, 168; deprived widow of Theognostus of her vineyard, 168-69, 191; shows great deference to Epiphanius of Cyprus, 170; Chrysostom's discourse on vices of women thought to be attack on, 170-71; provoked at Chrysostom's refusal to proceed against Theophilus of Alexandria in affair of Nitrian monks, 171-72; secures deposition of Chrysostom through Synod of the Oak, 172; compared by Chrysostom to Jezebel and Herodias, 173, 177, 179-80; letter of, recalling Chrysostom from his first exile, 174; praised by Chrysostom after his return, 176-78; affair of the silver statue of, 178-79; again attacked by Chrysostom, 179-80; and the events leading up to and including second exile of Chrysostom, 180-85; refuses to attend Christmas service in Santa Sophia (403 A. D.), 181; petitioned by Bishops loyal to Chrysostom and admonished by Paul of Crateia, 182; Chrysostom buried in Church of the Apostles near, 186; letter of Chrysostom to, 191

Euergetes, 18, 51, 52
Eugenius, Emperor, 122, 130, 136, 137, 214; letter of St. Ambrose to, 132-34; regarded as usurper by Ambrose, 134-35, 140
Eugraphia, court lady, 169
Euhemerism, of Firmicus Maternus, 63
Eumenius, Gallic rhetorician, 26 (n. 32), 42, 46, 62, 116
Eunomians, later Arians, 82
Eunomius, Arian leader, 83
Eusebians, 80
Eusebius of Caesarea, St., 13, 17, 57, 70, 71, 86, 87, 113, 148, 149, 156 (n. 22), 162, 168, 194, 212, 215, 217; chief source of knowledge of 2nd century apologists, 33-36; anxious for peace between Church and State, 40-41; and Constantine the Great, 41-44, 46-54, 56; and Lactantius, 45; estimate of, as an historian, 42, 53; compared with St. Ambrose, 118; on images and portraits of Constantine, 204-05
Eusebius of Nicomedia, 82
Eusebius of Vercelli, 86, 87, 103; letter of, to Constantius, 90
Eustathius of Antioch, praised Emperor Constantine at Nicaea, 43
Eutropius, minister of Arcadius, secures patriarchate for Chrysostom, 163; protected by Chrysostom, 169
Eutychius, Arian Bishop of Eleutheropolis, 93
Evander, Arcadian hero, 27
Evangelion, 18
Eve, referred to, 147
Ezekiel, Book of, referred to, 122 (n. 137)

Faith, duty of Emperor to preserve the, 64
Faustinus, presbyter, address with Marcellinus to Valentinian II, Theodosius, and Arcadius (*Libellus precum*), 97-98; *De Trinitate* and *Fides Theodosio Imperatori oblata*, 98 (n. 99)
Fialon, Eugene, 78 (n. 1), 83 (n. 17)
Firmicus, *see* Julius Firmicus Maternus
Flaccilla, Empress, wife of Theodosius I, 87, 98 (n. 99), 137
Flaccilla, daughter of Arcadius and Eudoxia, 173
Flavian, Bishop of Antioch, intercedes with Theodosius I for Antiochenes after sedition of 387 A. D., 189-90; alleged servility of, 213, 215
Flavianus, Virius Nicomachus, 116
Foerster, Th., 119 (n. 41)
Fortuna, of Emperor, *see Tyche*

Gainas, Gothic leader, 158; occupies Constantinople for more than six months, 169
Galerius, Emperor, death of, according to Lactantius, 45
Galla Placidia, Empress, 98 (n. 99)
Gaul, 30, 55 (n. 75), 100; embassies of St. Ambrose to court of Maximus in, 140-41, 162
Genethliakoi (logoi), 217
Genitura, of Emperor Hadrian, 61
Genius, of Emperor, 20; of Roman Empire (*genius publicus*), 116
George of Alexandria, *see* Pseudo-George
Germanicia, in Syria, 93
Germans, in the Empire, attitude of Synesius of Cyrene towards, 158, 160, 161; of Themistius, 161; of Chrysostom, 168 (n. 16)
Gesner, Conrad, 37 (n. 81)
God, Emperor referred to as a, 27, 29; asserted to be a, by Firmicus Maternus, 59-62; compared with, by Athanasius, 72-73, 109; by Chrysostom, 194-95; *see also* Christ and Emperor
Gold, Emperor made his way in panoply of, 187
Golgotha, cross over hill of, described by Cyril of Jerusalem, 68-70
Goodenough, E. R., 26 (n. 30)
Grabar, André, 47 (n. 29)
Grata, sister of Valentinian II, 130, 131, 147
Gratian, Emperor, 30 (n. 45), 128, 136, 137, 146-47, 214; called *divus* in memorial of Symmachus, 115, 116 (n. 27); Ambrose's works *De fide* and *De spiritu sancto* addressed to, 117-18; murdered by Maximus, beloved by Ambrose, 140-41
Gregory the Great, letters of, to Emperor Phocas, 215-16
Gregory Nazianzen, 36, 49, 88, 108, 140, 162, 212, 213; two invectives against Emperor Julian by, 104-06; praise of Constantius by, 104-05; analyzes nature of imperial power, 107, 133; on imperial images, 202, 202-04

Gregory of Nyssa, on "imperial virtues", 47; on death of Empress Flaccilla, 137; on imperial images, 201; on Empire in heaven and Empire on earth, 87, 217 (n. 5)
Grützmacher, Georg, 152 (n. 3), 153 (n. 7)
Gwatkin, H. M., 83 (n. 18)

Hadrian, Emperor, addressed by apologists Quadratus, 33, 34; Aristo of Pella, 33; and according to Eusebius by Aristides, 33; apotheosis of favorite of, ridiculed by Justin Martyr, 35; by Athanasius, 67; *genitura* of, in Hephaestion of Thebes, 61
Hagel, K. F., 54 (n. 69), 72 (n. 58), 74 (n. 66)
Halicarnassus, inscription from, 22
Hariolus, 60
Harnack, Adolf, 18 (n. 6), 33 (n. 67), 45
Harris, J. Rendel, 33 (n. 67)
Hartel, W., 93 (n. 50)
Haruspices, 59, 60
Hefele, K. J., and Dom H. Leclercq, 88 (n. 33)
Hellenistic background of Emperor-worship, 17-23
Hennecke, E., 33 (n. 67)
Hephaestion of Thebes, astrologer, 61
Hercules, guest of Evander at Pallanteum (Rome), 27; labors of, used on coins to portray Maximian's efforts in behalf of Empire, 28
Herculius, surname of Maximian, 27, *cf.* 28
Herod, referred to, 179
Herod Antipas, 14
Herodians, 14
Herodias, referred to, 147, 173, 179, 213
Heuten, Gilbert, 63 (n. 22)
Hiera grammata, 18
Hiereus megas, Arcadius represented as, in Synesius' allegory *On Providence*, 153
Hilary of Poitiers, St., 11, 74, 89 (n. 35), 104, 159, 216; works of, addressed to Emperor Constantius, 98-99; attitude of, towards Emperor in *Ad Constantium*, 99-100; in *Contra Constantium*, 100-03
Hippodrome, Chrysostom's scene of Emperor in, 188
Historia Arianorum, of Athanasius, 78-79, 80, 81, 86; resembles *Contra Constantium* of Hilary of Poitiers, 99, 100
Historia ecclesiastica, of Eusebius of Caesarea, 42, 43-44, 45; of Rufinus of Aquileia, 144-45; of Sozomen shows influence of study of Chrysostom, 126 (n. 71)
Holy Sepulchre, Church of, in Jerusalem, 43, 46
Homer, epic poet, 162
Homoousion, in Caesarean creed, 90
Honorius, Emperor, 30 (n. 45); St. Ambrose delivers funeral oration on Theodosius I in presence of, 136; writes to his brother Arcadius in remonstrance at latter's treatment of Chrysostom, 185
Hosius of Cordova, 90-91, 95, 161; letter of, to Emperor Constantius, 91-92
Hypatia of Alexandria, 152

Images, of the Emperor, 13, 38-39; where displayed, 196; materials used in manufacture of, without effect upon worth and dignity of such, 196-97; "in the hearts of men," 197-98; use of, for purposes of religious instruction and theological discussion, 198-201; of usurpers (*tyranni*), 201-02; edicts in Theodosian Code relating to, 196, 201-02, 211; adoration (*proskynesis*) and worship (*latreia*) of, 197, 202-11
Imperator, used of Christ, 18, *cf.* 62
Imperatoria potestas, 110, 133 (n. 103), *cf.* 139
Imperium, 12, 24, 25, 59, 63, 64, 65, 74, 81, 85, 87, 94, 108, 123, 134 (n. 108), 138, 141 (n. 133), 142 (n. 139), 144, 145, 150, 212, 213, 216; nature of, according to Gregory Nazianzen, 107-08; nature of, of Eugenius, 133-34; a miserable possession, according to Chrysostom, 171, 195; patristic attitude towards, basically anarchic, 194; *Romanum*, 27, 55, 148
In hoc signo vinces, 51
Innocent I, Pope, 181 (n. 64)
Irenaeus, St., explains origin of imperial government, 24-25
Irenaeus, correspondent of St. Ambrose, 143
Irene, St., Church of, 178 (n. 54)

Isaiah, Book of, referred to, 137 (n. 122)
Isaiah, Basil the Great's commentary on, 201
Ius naturale (*nomos physikos*), imperial rule has no basis in, 25, 142-44, 193-94

Januarius, Donatist Bishop, 31 (n. 62)
Jeremiah, Book of, referred to, 122 (n. 137)
Jerome, St., 13, 36, 70 (n. 51), 93, 98, 102, 144; on imperial images, 206,
Jerusalem, 68, 69, 80
Jesus, 138, 188; attitude of, towards Emperor, 13, 14-15, 16; apparent rival of Emperor for devotion of mankind, 20-21; referred to in Acts 17:7 as "a second Emperor," 21; fights at Emperor's side, 65; contrasted with Emperor by Chrysostom, 187 (n. 79); *see also* God, Christ and Emperor
Jews, 34; Jesus thought Emperor entitled to capitation-tax from, 14-15; imperial cult coinage abhorrent to, 15; Sicarii refuse to address Emperor as *Lord*, 20; show hostility to Paul and Silas, 21; attitude of St. Ambrose towards, in affair of Callinicum, 118-23
Jezebel, referred to, 147, 173, 179, 213
Joel, Book of, referred to, 137 (n. 122)
Johannites, followers of Chrysostom, charged with setting fire to Santa Sophia and persecuted, 184-85
John the Baptist, referred to, 147, 173, 179
John of Damascus, on imperial images, 202, 211; cited on imperial images, Chapter VIII, nn. 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 20, 29, 31; on functions of the Emperor, 218
Josephus, 20 (n. 11)
Jovian, Emperor, 103, 160; called *divus* in Christian inscriptions, 59 (n. 8); petitions of Arians to, 83-84
Judas, referred to, 173
Jude, referred to, 20
Julian, Emperor, the Apostate, 42, 55, 83-84, 100, 103, 121, 156-57, 159, 160, 212, 213, 217; called *divus* in Christian inscription, 59 (n. 8); invectives of Gregory Nazianzen against, 104-06; letter of Pseudo-Basil to, 106; references of Chrysostom to, 106-07; and the genius of the Empire (*genius publicus*), 116; and the military cult of the Emperor, 202-04
Julianus, jurist of 2nd century A. D., 24
Julius Caesar, offspring of Ares and Aphrodite, 19
Julius Firmicus Maternus, 33, 67, 68, 162; *Mathesis* and *De errore profanarum religionum* of, 57-58; references to Constantine the Great and his sons, 58-59; analysis of excursus on divinity of Emperor in *Math.*, 59-62, 66; analysis of attitude towards Emperor in *De errore*, 62-66; terms used to address Emperor in *De errore*, 66; alleged author of *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii*, 207-08 (n. 38)
Jupiter, divine protoype of Diocletian, 28
Justa, sister of Valentinian II, 130, 131, 147
Justice, strengthens the State, 119; imperial power bestowed by God for administration of, 143-44, 191
Justin Martyr, 32, 33, 36, 68; explains Christian *basileia* to Antoninus Pius, 23; "Render unto Caesar," 24; ridicules apotheosis of favorite of Emperor Hadrian, 35
Justina, Arian Empress, mother of Valentinian II, 109, 112, 123, 140, 213-14; struggle with St. Ambrose over a basilica for Arian worship in Milan, 109-14; compared by Ambrose with Eve, Jezebel, and Herodias, 147
Justinian, Emperor, and the *lex regia*, 24; quoted, 25; accepts theory of Emperor as "living law," 26, 112

Kaisarianos, 18
Kallinikos, title of Emperor, 51, 52, 85
Kathosiosis, high treason, Chrysostom banished on charge of, 173
Koch, Hugo, on massacre of Thessalonica, 126 (n. 71)
Koiné, meaning of *basileia* and *basileus* in the, 20-21
Kollwitz, J., 47 (n. 29)
Kosmokrator, Emperor on earth, God in heaven, each a, 72
Krautheimer, R., 47 (n. 29)

Krüger, G., 93 (n. 49)
Krueger, Paul, 24 (n. 23)
Kyriakos, 18
Kyrios, 18, 19-20, 50, 82, 197

Labarum, 51
Lactantius, 32, 33, 63; on the Emperors, 44-46
Latinus Pacatus Drepanius, panegyrist, 26, 42, 62, 116; panegyric of, on Theodosius the Great, 29-30
Latreia (and *Proskynesis*), 24, *cf.* 27, 29; of imperial images, 13, 23, 202-11
Law, *lex regia* transferred power from people to Emperor, 23-24; *lex veneranda* of God, in Firmicus Maternus, 64, 65; divine, superior to imperial, 94, 112, 133; Emperor should be first to keep his own, 112; Emperor's relation to *lex* in works of St. Ambrose, 142-45; in St. John Chrysostom, 193-94
Legatio pro Christianis (same as *Libellus pro Christianis*), of Athenagoras, 37 (n. 81), 217
Legibus absolutus, of the Emperor, 142-44
Leo the Great, attitude of, towards the imperial family in the East, 215-16
Leo III the Isaurian, iconoclastic Emperor, 218
Leo the Philosopher, 61
Lex, see Law
Lex animata, see Nomos empsychos
Libanius, of Antioch, rhetorician, 157, 159, 162, 203 (n. 23), 212, 217
Libellus precum, of Faustinus and Marcellinus, 97-98
Libellus pro Christianis, see Athenagoras
Liberius, Pope, 36, 90; and the Emperor Constantius, 88-89
Libya, 152
Licinius, Emperor, change in attitude of Eusebius of Caesarea towards, 44; letter of Eusebius to Constantia, wife of, 53
Lietzmann, 172 (n. 34)
Life of Constantine, of Eusebius, 41-42, 50 (n. 48), 53
Logos, 72-73
Lucifer of Calaris, 31 (n. 61), 46, 86, 87, 92-93, 100, 103; attacks of, upon Emperor Constantius, 93-97; correspondence of, with Florentius, *magister officiorum*, 94
Luciferians, followers of Lucifer of Calaris, petition (*Libellus precum*) of, to Valentinian II, Theodosius I, and Arcadius, 97-98
Lucius Verus, Emperor, 35, 36
Luke, gospel, referred to, "Render unto Caesar," 14; sun veiled at the crucifixion, 137 (n. 122)

Madden, F. W., 15 (n. 2)
Maecenas, cautions Augustus not to allow statues of himself to be made in gold or silver, 197-98
Magnentius, usurper, 88
Magus, 60
Malalas, John, 124 (n. 63)
Maleficus, 60
Marcellina, sister of St. Ambrose, 110, 114
Marcellinus, presbyter, 97-98
Marcellinus Comes, chronographer, 178 (n. 55)
Marcus Aurelius, addressed by Christian apologists, 32, 35-39, 217
Marcus Diaconus, 169 (n. 19)
Mark, gospel, referred to, "Render unto Caesar," 14; sun veiled at the crucifixion, 137 (n. 122)
Marsa, court lady, 169
Martyrs of Palestine, of Eusebius of Caesarea, 43
Mathematicus, 60
Mathesis, of Firmicus Maternus, 57-58; references to Constantine the Great and his sons in, 58-59; analysis of excursus on divinity of Emperor in, 59-62, 66
Matthew, gospel, referred to, "Render unto Caesar," 14; sun veiled at the crucifixion, 137 (n. 122)
Maurice, Emperor, 216
Maximian Herculius, Emperor, anonymous panegyric on, 26-28, 29, 217; death of, according to Lactantius, 45
Maximin Daia, Emperor, death of, according to Lactantius, 45-46; images of, mutilated, 202
Maximus, usurper, 118; attitude of St. Ambrose towards, 137, 140-41, 162, 214; servility of Gallican Bishops in presence of, 150-51, 215
Melito, of Sardis, Christian apologist, 32, 36; addressed Marcus Aurelius, 35
Memorial, of Symmachus, to Emperor Valentinian II, 115, 116, 146
Menander Rhetor, 160, 217 (n. 6)

Method of investigating Fathers' attitude towards Emperor, 11-13
Methodius, St., on imperial images, 197
Milan, Council of, 80, 88-89, 92; city of, 102, 109, 113, 122, 123, 125 (n. 71), 126, 134, 141, 163, 214
Miltiades, Christian apologist, 32, 36
Mimesis hyperkosmios, 156, 162
Minucius Felix, Christian apologist, 32, 208
Möhler, J. A., 83 (n. 18)
Mommsen, Th., 19 (n. 10), 24 (n. 23), 58, 153 (nn. 4, 7)
Monceaux, Paul, 45
Monks, a bad lot, according to Emperor Theodosius I, 122
Monodiai, 217
Montfaucon, Bernard de, 175 (n. 47), 180 (n. 62)
Moore, Clifford H., 58 (n. 4)
Morin, Dom Germain, 208
Mules, white, draw Emperor's chariot, 187
Municipal cults of living Emperor, unofficially organized in Egypt, 22
Mystery cults, 21, 63

Naboth, referred to, 141, 179
Nachor, 33 (n. 67)
Nathan, 122, 190 (n. 93)
Naturalis lex, see Ius naturale
Nazarius, panegyrist, 42, 62, 116
Nebuchadnezzar, 206
Neoplatonism and Neoplatonist, 58 (n. 5), 61-62, 156, 162
Nero, Emperor, 35, 101; *agathos daimon* of Alexandrians, 22
New Testament, attitude towards Emperor in, 14-17, 18-19, 20-21
Nicaea, references to Council of, 43, 53, 54, 79, 80, 90, 91, 144-45
Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulos, early 14th century historian, 186 (n. 77)
Nile, stands for Bosphorus in Synesius' allegory *On Providence*, 153
Nitrian monks, charged with Origenism, 170; prefer charges against Theophilus of Alexandria, 171-72
Nock, A. D., 25 (n. 28)
Noel, Conrad, 15 (n. 4)
Nomos empsychos (*lex animata*), "living law," theory of ruler as a, 26, 112
Norden, Ed., 58 (n. 5)
Numen, 74, 115, 146, 211; used of Emperor by pagans, but not by Christians, 31 (and especially n. 62); *cf.* 63 (n. 23), 89, 90, 97, 102
Numidia, 54

O'Brien, Sister M. B., 31-32 (n. 62), 97 (n. 96)
Oedipus, 32
Old Church, in Antioch, Chrysostom presbyter of, 163, 189
Olympias, 184
On Kingship, address of Synesius of Cyrene, to Emperor Arcadius, 152-62; summary of, 154-59; probable date of, 159; analysis of, 159-61
On Providence, allegorical history of 399-400 A. D. by Synesius of Cyrene, 153, 154, 158
Opitz, H. G., on Theophilus of Alexandria, 170 (n. 23)
Optatus of Milevis, St., attitude of, towards Emperor, 43, 54-56, 148, 150, 168
Orationes contra Arianos, of Athanasius, 73
Origen, 32; on worship and adoration of imperial images, 203, 206-07
Origenism, Nitrian monks charged with, 170
Osiris, stands for Aurelian in Synesius' allegory *On Providence*, 153

Pacatus, *see* Latinus Pacatus Drepanius
Paganism, attacked by Christian apologists, 32; destruction of, urged by Firmicus Maternus, 63-65; desire of Porphyrius of Gaza to suppress, in his diocese, 169
Pagrae, Syrian city north of Antioch, 163
Paideia, of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, in Athenagoras, 37, 39
Palanque, J.-R., 119 (n. 41), 125 (n. 71), 138
Palestine, persecution in, 40; Lucifer of Calaris in, 93, 97
Palladius, biographer of Chrysostom, 183
Pallanteum, 27
Pamphilus, martyr and friend of Eusebius, 40
Panegyric on Constantine, of Eusebius, 41-42, 53, 217; analysis of, 46-51
Panegyrics, pagan, to Emperors, 26-

31
Panegyricus Maximiano Augusto, 26-28
Paramythetikoi (*logoi*), 217
Parhelion, apparently phenomenon described by Cyril of Jerusalem to Emperor Constantius, 68-70
Parousia, 18
Parthia, 157
Passio SS. Scilitanorum, 20
Patricius, *notarius*, 184
Paul, St., 19, 25; attitude of, towards Emperor, 16-17; with Silas at Thessalonica, 21; quoted by Optatus of Milevis, 55; Chrysostom on, 200
Paul of Crateia, admonishes Empress Eudoxia, 182
Paulinus, Tyrian panegyric delivered by Eusebius of Caesarea in honor of, 44
Paulinus, biographer of St. Ambrose, on massacre of Thessalonica, 125, 126 (n. 71); on Ambrose's refusal of communion to Maximus, 141
Paulinus of Trèves, 103
Pax Augusti, 22
Pentadia, 184
Pentapolis, 152
Persians, 17
Personified virtues, imperial cult of (*culte des Abstractions*), 22-23
Peter, First Epistle to, 16-17
Peterson, E., 47 (n. 29)
Pharaoh, 176
Pharisees, 14
Philanthropia, of Emperor, 18, 21, 75, 76, 77, 78
Philip the Arabian, Emperor, 126 (n. 71)
Philippians, Epistle to, referred to, 20
Philippopolis, 80
Philochristos, 18, 74, 76, 78, 104, 166
Philokaisar, 18
Philosebastos, 18
Philosophy, accompanies Synesius of Cyrene into presence of Emperor Arcadius, 154, 155
Philostorgius, Arian historian, description of Empress Eudoxia by, 164; on Christian sacrifices to an image of Constantine, 204
Phocas, Emperor, 216
Phocas, martyr, relics of, translated from Pontus to Constantinople, 164-65
Photius, 9th century Patriarch of Constantinople, 172 (n. 33); epitomized Philostorgius, 204
Pilate, Pontius, the usurper Maximus execrated by St. Ambrose as a worse than, 141
Pittakia, in Augusteum in Constantinople, 178
Pityus, on northeastern shore of Black Sea, Chrysostom's place of exile changed to, 185-86
Planets, prayer of Firmicus Maternus to the, 59
Polycarp of Smyrna, 20
Porphyrius, Bishop of Gaza, seeks Chrysostom's aid, 169
Praenetus, in Bithynia, Chrysostom withdraws to, 173
Praetextatus, Vettius Agorius, 116
Presbeutikoi (*logoi*), 217
Priesthood, imperial, 87-88, 105, *cf.* 53, 91
Probus, Sextus Petronius, 116
Procla, 184
Procopius of Gaza, on worship and adoration of imperial images, 204, 207, 211
Proskynesis (and *Latreia*), 24, *cf.* 27, 29; of imperial images, 13, 23, 202-11
Prosper of Aquitaine, chronographer, 178 (n. 55)
Prosphonetikoi (*logoi*), 217
Pseudo-George of Alexandria, biography of St. John Chrysostom by, 126 (n. 71), 168 (n. 18); discourse of Chrysostom preserved at end of, 175-77
Ptolemais, 152, 156
Ptolemies, 17
Public penance, imposition of, in 4th century, 129
Pulcheria, daughter of Theodosius I, 87, 137
Pulcheria, Empress, attitude of Theodoret towards, 215
Purple, Emperor alone had right to wear the, 187

Quadratus, Christian apologist, 32, 33, 34

Raabe, E., 33 (n. 67)
Rauschen, G., 23 (n. 21)
Reatz, August, 208 (n. 38)
Redemption, Athanasius' explanation of, made clearer by imperial simile, 72-73
Remus, 28
"Render unto Caesar," 14-15, 16, 24,

92, 110, 114, 116-17; passages in St. Ambrose, 117 (n. 32); in St. John of Damascus, 218
Revelation, Book of, 15
Robertson, A., 82 (n. 16)
Robinson, J. A., 20 (n. 13), 33 (n. 67)
Romans, Paul's Epistle to, cited or referred to, 14, 16-17, 25, 143, 194
Rome, 26-27, 28, 29, 30, 102, 117
Romulus, 28
Rose, H. J., 61 (n. 17)
Rufinus of Aquileia, translator of Eusebius of Caesarea, 36; attitude of, towards *imperium*, 144-45; translator of Origen on worship and adoration of imperial images, 207

Sabellianism, Faustinus' defense against charge of, sent to Theodosius I, 98 (n. 99)
Sacerdotium, 12, 81, 87, 108, 123, 149-50, 212, 216
Sanctity of Emperor, pagan background of, 66-67
Santa Sophia, in Constantinople, 165, 178, 181, 182, 184; destroyed by fire on day of Chrysostom's departure for his second exile, 184-85
Sarah, 176
Sardica, Council of, 71, 80, 85, 90, 101
Sarmatia, 37
Saul, David saves life of, 140, 192
Savile, Sir Henry, 180 (n. 62)
Saviour, 18, 19, 21-22, 49, *cf.* 85
Schwartz, Ed., 37 (n. 81), 44 (n. 12)
Scott, Kenneth, 196 (n. 3)
Sebastognostos, 18
Sebastologos, 18
Sebastos, title, 52, 85
Secundus, Arian Bishop, 82
Seeck, Otto, 152, 172 (n. 34), 180 (n. 62)
Seleucia, 84
Seleucids, 17
Senate, Roman, for most part Christian in later fourth century, 29; apotheosis of Emperor voted by, 67-68
Severeian of Gabala, enemy of Chrysostom, 169, 179, 183, 184, 214; on imperial images, 196, 200
Severus, character and death of, acmording to Lactantius, 45
Sicarii, 20
Sickel, W., 67 (n. 41)
Silâh Müzesi, Turkish Arms Museum, in Istamboul, 178 (n. 54)
Silas, in Thessalonica, 21
Silvina, 184
Simplicius, Prefect of Constantinople, 178
Sirmium, 109
Skutsch, Franz, 58 (n. 5), 62
Socrates, ecclesiastical historian, 41, 70 (n. 51), 204
Soothsayers, 60
Sosikosmios, 18
Soter, 18, 19, 21
Souter, A., 208 (n. 38)
Sozomen, ecclesiastical historian, 70 (n. 51), 125-26 (n. 71), 170 (n. 27), 175, 184
Spain, praised by Pacatus as birthplace of Theodosius I, 29
Speratus of Scilli, 20
Stars, Emperor not subject to motions of the, 59-60
State, *see* Church and State
Stephanotikoi (logoi), 217
Stephens, W. R. W., 213 (n. 1)
Stiglmayr, J., 208 (n. 38)
Stilicho, 136, 158
Stilting, J., 175-76 (n. 49)
Sulpicius Severus, laments subservience of 4th century Gallican episcopate to Emperor Maximus, 150-51, 215
Sun, darkening of, associated with calamity, 137 (n. 122)
Symmachus, Q. Aurelius, memorial presented by, to Valentinian II, 115, 116, 146
Synesius of Cyrene, 51, 132, 136-37, 187, 215, 217; address of, to Emperor Arcadius, 152-62; embassy of, to Arcadius and residence of, in Constantinople, 152-53; allegorical history of, *On Providence*, 153, 154, 158; trustworthiness of, 154; summary of address *On Kingship*, 154-59; analysis of *On Kingship*, 159-61; Philosophy accompanies, into presence of Emperor, 154, 155; boldness of, 154, 155, 157-58, 159-61; condemns tyranny, 156; rails against cloistered existence of Emperor, 157; hates barbarians, 158; compared with St. Ambrose, 161-62
Synod of the Oak, first deposition of St. John Chrysostom by, 172, 174 (n. 43), 179, 181
Syria, 17, 185

"Tall Brothers of Nitria," affair of, 170, 171-72

Tatian, Christian apologist, 32
Terms of address, *see* Titles
Tertullian, 32, 87
Thebaid, 93, 97
Thebes, stands for Constantinople in Synesius' allegory *On Providence*, 153
Theia grammata, 18
Theiotes, theios, 18, 47 (n. 28), 76, 104
Themistius, 159, 160; propounds theory of ruler as a "living law," 26, 112; attitude of, towards Germans, 161
Theodore of Trimithus, 126 (n. 71)
Theodoret, ecclesiastical historian, 43, 125-26 (n. 71), 186, 215
Theodoret and Polichronius, commentary of, *In Ezechielem*, referred to, 205 (n. 29)
Theodosian Code, *see Codex Theodosianus*
Theodosius I, the Great, Emperor, 12, 25, 130, 132, 159, 160, 163, 214; Themistius' oration *On the Humanity of*, 26; address of Pacatus to, in Roman Curia, 26, 29-30; petition of Faustinus and Marcellinus (*Libellus precum*) addressed to, 97-98; and the affair of Callinicum, 118-23; attitude of St. Ambrose towards, after massacre of Thessalonica, 124-30; letter of Ambrose to, after defeat of Eugenius, 134-36; Ambrose's funeral oration on, 136-38; Chrysostom's homily on fourth anniversary of death of, 188-89, 217; attitude of Chrysostom towards, in *Homilies on the Statues*, 189-90; invested imperial images with right of asylum for fugitives, 201; attitude of Bishop Flavian towards, 189-90, 213
Theodosius II, 24 (n. 23), 170, 186, 211
Theognostos, 18
Theognostus, widow of, deprived of her vineyard by Empress Eudoxia, 168-69, 191
Theologos, 18
Theonas, Arian Bishop, 82
Theophanes, chronographer, 124 (n. 63)
Theophilus of Alexandria, consecrates Chrysostom Patriarch of Constantinople, 163; hates Chrysostom, 169-70; charges Nitrian monks with Origenism, 170; arrives in Constantinople to answer charges of Nitrian monks, 171; Chrysostom anxious to conciliate, 171; contrives Chrysostom's deposition through Synod of the Oak, 172; reproached by Chrysostom for attempt to seduce Church of Constantinople, 175 (n. 47), 176; and the second exile of Chrysostom, 180-81, 214
Theophilus of Antioch, Christian apologist, 32; defines Christian's duty to Emperor, 24, 34
Theos, 18; as title of living Emperor in Egypt, 22
Theou huios, 18
Thessalonica, Theodosius I and the massacre of, 124-30, 141; historical sources, legendary accounts, and modern discussions of attitude of St. Ambrose towards Emperor in massacre of, 125-26 (n. 71)
Thomas, St., martyry of, at Drypia, 165
Thorndike, Lynn, 58 (n. 5)
Thure et vino supplicare, 23
Thyestes, 32
Tiberius, 15
Tillemont, Le Nain de, 176 (n. 49)
Timasius, general of Theodosius I, 122
Timothy, First Epistle to, referred to, 55
Titles of Emperor, terms of address and reference, 18; 30-31 (pagan panegyrists); 44, 47-48, 50, 51-52 (Eusebius of Caesarea); 54-55 (Optatus of Milevis); 66 (Firmicus Maternus); 69-70 (Cyril of Jerusalem); 71 (western Bishops at Council of Sardica); 74-77, 78-79 (Athanasius); 82, 83-84, 84-85, 85 (Arians); 85 (orthodox Bishops at Ariminum); 88-89 (Liberius); 90 (Eusebius of Vercelli); 95-97 (Lucifer of Calaris); 98 (Faustinus and Marcellinus); 99, 100, 102-03 (Hilary of Poitiers); 104, 106 (Gregory Nazianzen), 106 (Pseudo-Basil); 106 (Chrysostom); 115 (Symmachus); 145-47 (Ambrose), *cf.* 162 (Synesius); 166, 178 (n. 54), 188, 190-91, *cf.* 173, 179 (Chrysostom), 218 (John of Damascus); cult titles and epithets not used by Christians, 31, 63 (n. 23), 89, 90, 97, 102, 108, 146, 162

Titus, Epistle to, 16
Toulouse, 102
Trajan, Emperor, 159, 160
Trèves, panegyric on Maximian delivered in 289 A. D. at, 26-28, 217; anonymous panegyrist of 310 A. D. at, 74; victims of Constantius at, according to Hilary of Poitiers, 102
Tribigild, Gothic leader, 158
Tribunes, Roman, sacrosanctity of, inherited by Emperor, 66-67
Tribunicia potestas, 66-67
Tricennalia, of Constantine, 43, 46
Trinity, in heaven, paralleled by three Augusti on earth, 57; work on the, addressed by Faustinus to Empress Flaccilla, 98 (n. 99)
Tropaiouchos, 188
Tyche (*Fortuna*), of Emperor, above the law, 25 (n. 28), 26
Typhos, character in Synesius' allegory *On Providence*, 153
Tyranny, of St. Ambrose over Emperor Valentinian II, 149-50; condemned by Synesius of Cyrene, 156
Tyrants, have no true claim to title of Emperor, 50, 107, *cf.* 133-34, 140-41; criminal offense to possess images of *tyranni* (usurpers), 201-02
Tyre, 40, 80, 88, 172

Ulpian, quoted on *lex regia*, 24
Ursacius, Arian leader, 82, 98-99 (n. 100)
Uzziah, King, reproached by the priest Azariah, 190, 191

Valens, Arian leader, 82, 98-90 (n. 100)
Valens, Emperor, 54
Valentinian I, Emperor, 54, 82, 111; called *divus* in memorial of Symmachus, 115, 116 (n. 27); St. Augustine's panegyric in honor of, 164
Valentinian II, Emperor, 30 (n. 45), 97, 109, 110, 132, 133, 136, 140, 162, 214; and St. Ambrose in contest over basilica for Arian worship in Milan, 109-14; memorial addressed to, by Symmachus, 115; admonished by Ambrose, 117; Ambrose's funeral oration on, 130-32; and the "tyranny" of Ambrose, 148-50
Valentinian III, Emperor, 24; called *divus* in Christian inscription, 59 (n. 8)
Valentinians, sect of, 119
Van Ortroy, Fr., on the massacre of Thessalonica, 125-26 (n. 71)
Verona, 126
Vestals, petition to Valentinian II for return of privileges and endowments to, 115
Victoria (*Augusti*), 22
Victory, altar of, 115, 117
Vienne, 131
Virtus, 84, 135
Vita Chrysostomi, of Pseudo-George of Alexandria, discourse of Chrysostom preserved at end of, 175-77
Vita Constantini, of Eusebius of Caesarea, 41-42, 50 (n. 48), 53
Von Arnim, Hans, 160 (n. 36)
Von Gebhardt, O., 20 (n. 12)

Wendland, Paul, 19 (n. 8), 21 (n. 16), 58 (n. 5)
Wessely, C., 20 (n. 14)
Wilcken, U., 20 (n. 14)
Wilmart, Dom André, 99
Worship of Emperor, *see Latreia*

Zealots, 15
Zosimus, pagan historian, 42, 185 (n. 73)

Titulorum Index et Potiorum Verborum

GRAECA

ἁγιωσύνη, 174
αἱρετικός, 77
αἰώνιος, 74, 82, 85, 162
ἀνεξικακία, 77, 78
ἄρχων, 36, 50, 189
ἀσέβεια, 78, 79, 106, 203, *cf.* 197
ἀσεβέστατος, 106
αὔγουστος, 52, 69, 74, 75, 85, 177, 188
αὐτοκράτωρ, 20 (n. 15), 37, 50, 52, 188
βασιλεία, 20, 23, 26, 47, 69, 84
βασίλειον, 83, 84
βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, 105
βασιλεύς, 16, 18, 20, 21, 37, 43, 44, 47, 48, 52, 61, 69, 70 (n. 50), 72, 73, 75, 78, 82, 85, 104, 106, 107, 156, 162, 197, 199
βασιλικός, 39, 47, 48, 50, 166, 197, 200
βασιλίς, 176

γαληνότης, γαληνότατος, 106
γενναιότατος, 104
δεσπότης, 20, 70 (n. 50), 82, 85
εὐεργέτης, εὐεργετικός, 18, 51, 52
εὐλάβεια, 70 (n. 50), 75, 76
εὐσέβεια, 44, 50, 69, 70, 75, 76, 83, 104, 190
εὐσεβής, εὐσεβέστατος, 69, 70, (n. 50), 72, 74, 76, 85, 188
ἡμερότης, 50, 75
ϑεῖος, ϑειότατος, 18, 47 (n. 28), 76, 104
ϑεομισής, 44
ϑεοσέβεια, 52, 75, 77, 78
ϑεοσεβής, ϑεοσεβέστατος, 51, 75, 76
ϑεοφίλεια, 191
ϑεοφιλής, ϑεοφιλέστατος, 44, 52, 69, 70, 74, 83
ἱέρεια, 177
καϑηγεμών, of God, 47
Καισαρες, 52
καλλίνικος, 51, 52, 85
καλοκάγαϑία, 75, 106
κράτος, 70, 83
κύριος, 18, 19, 20, 50, 82, 197
μακάριος, μακαριώτατος, 43, 52, 70, 74, 83
μακαρίτης, 76
μέγας, μέγιστος, 37, 47, 52
μισάνϑρωπος, 44
νικητής, 50, 52
ὀνομαστότατος, 104
Παμβασιλεύς, of God, 47, 48, 51, 52, 69
πανευσεβέστατος, 70 (n. 50)
σεβαστός, 52, 85
τροπαιοῦχος, 188
φιλαλήϑης, 75
φιλανϑρωπία, 18, 21, 75, 76, 77, 78
φιλάνϑρωπος, φιλανϑρωπότατος, 37, 52, 75, 104, 190
φιλόϑεος, 52, 74
φιλομαϑέστατος, 37, 75
φιλοσοφώτατος, 83, 190
φιλόχριστος, φιλοχριστότατος, 18, 74, 76, 78, 104, 166

LATINA

aequissimus, 96
aequitas, 22, 89, 119 (n. 42)
aeternitas, 94, 115, 146
aeternus, 30, 146; *cf.* 89, 90, 97, 102, 108, 162
animus, 89, 115
Augustus, 15, 22, 52, 57, 59, 69, 70, 71, 74, 75, 84, 85, 89, 94, 98 (n. 99), 115, 117-18, 127, 129 (n. 83), 134, 135, 140, 146, 178 (n. 54)
beatus, beatissimus, 30, 71, 85, 100, 129 (n. 83), 134, 146
benignifica natura, 71
benignus, benignissimus, 30, 89
benivolentia, 98 (n. 90)
bonitas, 71
bonus, 99, 115, 120 (n. 43)
Caesar, 15, 46, 87, 100
catholicus, 98 (n. 99)
Christianus, Christianissimus, 55, 89, 146
clemens, clementissimus, 89, 90, 111 (n. 4), 118 (n. 37), 120, 132, 146
clementia, 71, 84, 85, 89, 115, 128, 146
devotio, 89, 98 (n. 99)
dignantissimus, 102
dignatio, 102
divinus, 28, 84, 110, 115, 116
divus, 31, 58, 58-59, 59 (n. 8), 115
dominus, 19, 20 (n. 13), 31, 62, 71, 84, 85, 90, 94, 100, 115, 146, 178 (n. 54)
felicitas, 145
felix, 145
fidelissimus, 146
florentissimus, 129 (n. 83)
gloria, 84, 146
gloriosissimus, 71, 84, 85, 89, 90, 98 (n. 99), 146
haereticus, 98
imperator, 18, 55, 62, 66, 82, 84, 85, 88, 89, 90, 96, 98 (n. 99), 100, 102, 103, 107, 111 (n. 4), 114 (n. 16), 115, 118 (nn. 36, 37), 127, 129 (n. 83), 132, 134, 135, 141 (n. 133), 146
imperium in General Index
inclytus, 115
indulgentissimus, 30
invictus, invictissimus, 30
iustissimus, 96, 98 (n. 99)
largissimus, 115
lenitas, 71, 89
maiestas, 32 (n. 62), 146, *cf.* 89
mansuetudo, 71, 89, 98 (n. 99), 146
maximus, 31
misericordia, 71

misericors, 55
mitis, 120
nobilissimus, 31
numen, 74, 115, 146, 211; *cf.* 21, 31 (n. 62), 63 (n. 23), 89, 90, 97, 102
optimus, 102, 103, 115, 147
pater patriae, 115
perennitas, 89, 102, 146
perpetuus, 30, 129 (n. 83)
pietas, 71, 84, 85, 89, 102, 127, 128, 145, 146
pius, piissimus, 84, 85, 96, 98 (n. 99), 102, 115, 120, 145, 146
praestantissimus, 31
princeps, 24, 27, 62, 66, 95, 97, 115, 120 (n. 43), 138, 146, 206
provisio, 98 (n. 99)
prudentia, 85, 89, 98 (n. 99)
prudentissimus, 30, 31 (n. 61), 96
regina, 98 (n. 99)
religio, 98 (n. 99)
religiosus, religiosissimus, 55, 85, 88, 89, 98 (n. 99), 99, 100, 102, 103
rex, 95, 96, 98, 139, 142, 207
sacerdotium in General Index
sacratissimus, 30, 66
sacrosanctus, 66
sanctitas, 66-67, 71, 85
sanctus, sanctissimus, 30, 66, 85, 89, 96, 118 (n. 36), 128, 129 (n. 83), 146, 147
sapientia, 71, 85, 98 (n. 99)
tranquillitas, 89, 98 (n. 99), 129 (n. 83), 146
tranquillus, tranquillissimus, 89, 120, 146
triumphator, 115
tyrannus, 95, 101, 148-50, 201-02, *cf.* 156
usurpator, 135, *cf.* 140
victor, 27, 115
victoriosissimus, 84
vindex fidei, 85, 98 (n. 99)

Date Due

~~NEW BOOK~~
~~FACULTY~~
~~FACULTY~~
[redacted]
~~3/12/0[illegible]~~
~~APR 3 0 1988~~
~~APR 1 2 2009~~
~~JUN 1 5 1990~~
~~NO 3 '52~~
~~JUN 1 5 1991~~
~~JUN 1 5 1992~~
~~FACULTY~~
~~FEB 1 1992~~
~~MAR 1 '61~~
~~APR 0 5 2010~~
~~FACULTY~~
JUN 8 199[illegible]
JUN 3 0 2015
~~DEC 1 [illegible]~~
~~MAY [illegible]~~
JUL 1 [illegible]
AUG 9 [illegible]
~~JUN 1 5 1976~~
AUG 1 1 [illegible]
~~JUN 1 5 1976~~
8-31-93
~~JUN 1 5 1977~~
~~JUN 1 5 1978~~
SEP 2 [illegible] 1993
~~OCT 0 5 1993~~
~~JUN 1 5 1984~~
~~JUN 1 1 1996~~

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01001 9133